00037412

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 July, 2018

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS

AND

HER ACCUSERS

00037412

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS

AND HER ACCUSERS

EMBRACING

A NARRATIVE OF EVENTS FROM THE DEATH OF JAMES V. IN 1542 UNTIL THE DEATH OF QUEEN MARY IN 1587

BY

JOHN HOSACK

BARRISTER-AT-LAW

37412

SECOND EDITION, MUCH ENLARGED

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS
EDINBURGH AND LONDON
MDCCCLXXIV

The Right of Translation is reserved

923.141
Mar/Hes/Mar
37412.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND VOLUME.

SINCE the first volume of this work was published, the singular discovery has been made that the Queen of Scots was never legally married to the Earl of Bothwell. It is well known that in the previous year—namely, in 1566—he had been married to the Lady Jane Gordon, a sister of the Earl of Huntly, and that before his pretended marriage with the queen he obtained a divorce from his wife on the ground that he was related to her in the fourth degree of consanguinity. But it is now certain that before their marriage they had obtained a dispensation from the Pope's legate in Scotland,[1] and they were therefore legally married, according to the canons of the Catholic Church. It follows that as marriage had been publicly declared to be indissoluble by the canons of that

[1] The second husband of Lady Bothwell was the Earl of Sutherland, and the original dispensation is preserved at Dunrobin.—See the Historical Commissioners' Second Report, p. 177. The true date of the dispensation is not, as there stated, the 13th March, but the 13th of the Calends of March—namely, the 17th of February. This interesting document was discovered by Dr John Stuart, of the General Register House, Edinburgh.

Church,[1] the queen could contract no lawful marriage with Bothwell during the lifetime of his wife.

The question naturally arises, Was Queen Mary aware of the existence of this dispensation, and did she knowingly contract a marriage which, in the eye of her Church, was absolutely and incurably void? Her adversaries will probably answer in the affirmative, on the assumption that her infatuated attachment to Bothwell rendered her regardless of all consequences; and if they could produce any trustworthy proofs of this extraordinary affection, the argument would be strong, if not conclusive. But as no evidence which they have been able to adduce upon this point will bear examination, we must believe that she was ignorant of the existence of this dispensation when she consented to marry Bothwell.

There is one undisputed point in the history of Mary—namely, that throughout her life she was true to her religion; and although she explained to her relatives in France that she had been forced by circumstances to consent to marry Bothwell, there is nothing in her conduct or in her correspondence which indicates a doubt as to the validity of the marriage. We shall find that at a subsequent period she appears to have been made aware of the true state of the case; for, in writing to the Pope in the year 1571,[2] she speaks of the "*pretended divorce*" of

[1] By the famous canon of the Council of Trent of 1563.

[2] Labanoff, iii. 232.

Bothwell from his wife. But the question is, whether at the time she knowingly contracted an invalid marriage.

There were at least three persons aware of the existence of the dispensation—namely, Bothwell, his wife, and Archbishop Hamilton, by whom the instrument had been granted; and it is to be observed that all three were interested in concealing it from the queen. Bothwell had committed an undoubted act of treason in carrying off his sovereign and detaining her a prisoner for upwards of a week at Dunbar, and he would only hope to escape the consequences by inducing her to marry him. We may add that, being a rigid Protestant, he would care nothing either for the Catholic dispensation or the Catholic divorce. He had been divorced from his wife at her suit by the Protestant Consistorial Court, and that was sufficient to satisfy his religious scruples, if any such he ever entertained. It was the obvious interest of Bothwell, therefore, to keep the existence of the dispensation in the dark; and he appears to have purchased the silence of his wife by settling upon her for life, notwithstanding the divorce, her full jointure over his estates.[1] Archbishop Hamilton had the strongest reason of all for keeping the matter secret, for it was he who, as the Pope's legate, had granted the dispensation for the marriage

[1] Douglas Peerage, by Wood, i. 231. She is there described as "a woman of great *prudence*, and enjoyed a jointure out of the Bothwell estate from 1567 to her death in 1629, in the 84th year of her age."

of Bothwell with his wife, and it was he who subsequently pronounced sentence of divorce between them on the very ground that no such dispensation had been granted.

It may be said, and truly said, that it was the duty of the archbishop, as Primate of Scotland, to have acquainted the queen with the existence of this dispensation, and to have informed her that she could not, by the canons of her Church, contract a valid marriage with Bothwell. It is nowhere stated that he made any such communication to her. But a very sufficient reason can be suggested for his silence. We learn from Sir William Drury, the Marshal of Berwick, that the Hamiltons were believed at the time to have done their best to promote the Bothwell marriage[1] with the view of ruining the queen. As the brother of the archbishop was, after her and her infant son, the next heir to the crown, he had an obvious and very powerful motive for keeping secret the fact of the dispensation.

The three principal parties concerned — namely, Bothwell, his wife, and the archbishop—were all therefore strongly interested in maintaining silence; and for these reasons it is infinitely more probable that the queen was kept in ignorance of the dispensation than that she should have consented to a marriage which

[1] "The Hamiltons," he says, "are furtherers of the divorce, hoping to attain the sooner to their desired end."—Quoted from Record Office, i. 321.

she knew at the time was not only absolutely void, but which could not by any possibility be rendered valid.[1]

At page 79 of this volume will be found a letter from the French ambassador in London, M. Paul de Foix, which throws a new light on the policy and practices of Elizabeth's favourite secretary, Cecil. That he was an exceedingly unscrupulous minister is well known to every one at all acquainted with his history; but that he should have set on foot a most wicked calumny, with the deliberate purpose of destroying the reputation of the Queen of Scots, could hardly have been believed by his worst enemies. We find, however, that well knowing that the murder of Riccio had been planned for weeks beforehand,[2] he furnished the French ambassador with a grossly false and slanderous account of the transaction. He informed De Foix

[1] I may state that the remarks on the character of Archbishop Hamilton (p. 91, 92) were written before I was aware of the existence of the "dispensation."

[2] This is clearly proved by the correspondence preserved in the Record Office.

Riccio was murdered on the 9th of March 1566. On the 13th of February previous, Randolph wrote from Edinburgh to the Earl of Leicester, "I know that if that take effect which is intended, David, with the consent of the king, shall have his throat cut within these ten days," &c.—Vol. i. 133.

A few days after the date of this letter, Randolph was ordered to quit Scotland, as he had been detected supplying money to the friends of the rebel lords. He took up his residence in Berwick with the Earl of Bedford.

On the 6th of March, three days before the murder, Bedford and Randolph wrote jointly to Elizabeth that "a matter of no small consequence was about to take place in Scotland. We hope," they added, "that by this means my Lord of Murray shall be brought home without

that Darnley had slain Riccio while actually in the embraces of the queen; and it is clear from his reply that the French ambassador implicitly believed the story. Nothing can more strikingly display the ruthless spirit of hostility entertained by Cecil against the Queen of Scots than his invention of this monstrous calumny, which it was doubtless his intention, through the instrumentality of the French ambassador, to promulgate throughout Europe. As even Riccio's assassins never ventured to make so monstrous a charge against their sovereign, and it cannot be shown that he derived his information from any other source, Cecil must bear the responsibility of the fabrication.

your majesty's further suit to the queen his sovereign, and therefore we have thought it good to stay the sending of your majesty's letters in his behalf."—Record Office, Scotland. They were therefore very confident of the success of the plot.

On the 8th of March, the day before the murder, Bedford and Randolph wrote to Cecil, "Murray is to be at Edinburgh to-morrow—the intention towards a certain person to be executed before Murray's coming."—Record Office, Scotland.

On the 8th of March, Murray, who had been the first to sign the bond for Riccio's murder (see vol. i. 135), wrote to Cecil that "he and the rest of his company are summoned home for the weal of the religion." —Record Office. On the 9th of March Riccio was murdered.

On the 11th of March, Bedford wrote to Cecil that the Earl of Murray and other lords had gone to Edinburgh. He adds, "David is despatched and dead, as I had heard it should be."—Record Office.

On the 16th of March, Bedford wrote to Elizabeth that he had paid £1000 by her desire to the Earl of Murray.

On the 21st of March, Randolph wrote to Cecil that the queen had returned to Edinburgh, and the murderers had fled. He adds, "the king repents of it, and confesses that he was abused."

On the 22d March, Cecil wrote to the French ambassador in London. His letter is not to be found in the Record Office nor in the French archives, where a careful search has been made for it. But from the reply of De Foix, which will be found at p. 79, no doubt can be entertained as to the nature and object of the communication.

We know that the assassins of Riccio had a double object in view—the one was the restoration to power of the banished Earl of Murray and his associates, and the other was the deposition of the queen. From the peculiar nature of Cecil's communication to De Foix, we cannot doubt that if their plans had not been defeated by her spirit and address, it was their intention to depose her on the ground of her alleged criminal intimacy with Riccio, of which they would have been able to produce evidence quite as trustworthy as the notorious "casket letters."

A circumstance connected with these letters has been lately pointed out to me by my friend Mr E. M. Thompson, of the Manuscript Department of the British Museum, to whom I take this opportunity of returning my sincere thanks for the assistance he has been on all occasions ready to afford me in the preparation of this volume.

It is well known that the "casket letters" were never subjected to any examination in Scotland; and the first detailed account which we have of them is contained in a despatch to Queen Elizabeth by the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Sussex, and Sir Ralph Sadler, the commissioners she had appointed to meet the Earl of Murray at York, and to whom he caused to be shown *privately* the alleged letters of his sister to Bothwell. The original despatch which they sent to Elizabeth after examining these letters is still extant. In it we perceive that various alterations have been

made; but Mr Thompson has discovered that it is still possible to make out all the erased passages, and he has kindly furnished me with an entire copy of the despatch, containing both the passages erased and those substituted for them before it was sent off. It is printed in the Appendix.[1]

It will be seen from several of the erased passages that Elizabeth's commissioners, when the despatch was written, expressed their conviction that the letters exhibited to them were genuine. But something must have occurred to shake their belief before it was sent off; for in it, as finally altered, they carefully refrained from expressing any opinion on the matter, but threw the entire responsibility on the Scotch commissioners.

It is remarkable that they did not think fit to rewrite a paper of so much importance, but it is fortunate for the interests of truth that they did not. What led them to doubt the genuineness of the letters we only can conjecture, but there was one obvious reason which upon reflection might have occurred to them. The letters which Murray produced at York were all in Scotch,[2] yet they were

[1] See Appendix A.

[2] The letters produced by Murray at York have disappeared, and their disappearance is easily accounted for. As they were in Scotch, and declared to be in Mary's own hand, an attempt must have been made to imitate her writing. To have preserved them would have been to preserve conclusive proof of the forgery, for it is certain that they were produced as originals. The language of Elizabeth's commissioners is upon this point clear and explicit: "And these men here do constantly affirm the said letters and other writings which they produce *of her own hand to be of*

written, as he and his associates most solemnly declared, in his sister's own hand. But it is highly probable that Norfolk, Sussex, and Sadler, being all men conversant with public affairs, had seen various original letters of the Queen of Scots; and if so, they never could have seen any previous writing of hers in Scotch. They could hardly have been ignorant that French was the language she invariably employed in her private correspondence, and this circumstance was alone sufficient to induce them to pause before committing themselves to any positive opinion.

It may be said that these alterations in the despatch prove nothing beyond the praiseworthy caution of the commissioners. But a private letter was subsequently addressed by Sussex to Cecil which throws much additional light on the matter. From this letter it appears that he then entertained such strong doubts as to the authenticity of Mary's alleged epistles that he did not believe Murray would venture to produce them. The letter of Sussex was dated eleven days after the despatch;[1] and after full consideration, this was the conclusion at which he had arrived. The connection between the altered despatch and the opinion thus finally expressed by Sussex is obvious. They mutually, in fact, explain each other.

The history of the proceedings of Elizabeth's com-

her own hand indeed, and do offer to swear and take their oath thereupon," &c.—See Appendix A.

[1] See his letter, vol. i., Appendix A.

missioners at York may be briefly stated thus: We may conclude, from their despatch as it was originally written, that they at first believed the contents of the casket to be genuine. On reflection they refrained from committing themselves to any opinion on the matter; and they finally expressed, through their colleague Sussex, the strongest doubts as to their authenticity. Yet they recommended, in accordance with the tortuous policy of the age, that Murray should be forced to produce his proofs, not because they believed them to be genuine, but to render the breach between him and his sister final and irreparable. This advice, it is well known, was implicitly followed by Cecil.

Under the head of Appendix B are now printed, for the first time, a variety of letters and documents, thirty in number, originally deposited in the Scots College at Paris, and now in Blairs College, Aberdeenshire. In the same collection there are a number of letters of the Queen of Scots addressed to her ambassador in Paris, James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow. These letters and documents are nearly all in cipher, but they were deciphered with much labour by the late Dr Kyle, and the letters of Queen Mary have been already printed in the valuable collection of Prince Labanoff. The letters now printed were written, not by her, but for the most part by various of her friends and partisans in Scotland, and some of them are highly interesting. I have thought it best to print the whole collection.

and they are now given to the public as they were deciphered by Dr Kyle.

Among the letters now published will be found one from Maitland of Lethington, in which he minutely describes the state of parties in Scotland after he had finally gone over to the side of the queen.[1] But the most important of the series, in a historical point of view, is a correspondence which proves that the Earl of Morton while Regent of Scotland made friendly overtures to Queen Mary, and even offered to do all in his power to restore her to her kingdom. This is a most remarkable fact. Morton, it is well known, had been the most active of all her enemies in Scotland. He it was, in fact, who finally deposed her, and not only charged her with the murder of her husband, but produced against her at Westminster the famous forged letters of the casket. He had subsequently, in the years 1572 and 1574,[2] expressed to Cecil his readiness to have her put to death in Scotland; yet in 1576 we find him professing the most ardent loyalty to the sovereign he had undertaken to murder, and offering to make every sacrifice to restore her to her throne.[3] It was because Mary instinctively recoiled from all dealings with such a man that secret negotiations were not at this time set on foot for her restoration.

It further appears, from a letter written by Esmé

[1] Appendix B, No. 5. [2] See p. 149 and 184 of this volume.
[3] See Appendix B. Letters of Beaton of Balfour, Nos. 12, 13, and 14; and letter from Lord Ogilvy, No. 19.

Stewart, Duke of Lennox,[1] that it was intended to charge Morton with the murder of the Earl of Atholl. Atholl, it is well known, died of poison. Morton was universally suspected of having caused his death; and we find Lennox desiring Mary's ambassador in Paris to send to Scotland a person whom he names, and for whom he sends a safe-conduct, who, he says, it was ascertained had purchased the poison. But as Morton was not put on his trial for the murder of Atholl, we may assume that this important witness either kept out of the way or did not arrive in Scotland in time. Morton was eventually tried, and convicted of the crime of which he had accused the queen —namely, the murder of Darnley.

The two unfinished sonnets in the handwriting of Queen Mary, a facsimile of which is prefixed to this volume, have never before been published. They are, together with the lines addressed to her favourite poet Rousard, preserved in the Bodleian Library.

[1] See Appendix B, No. 25.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOL. II.

CHAPTER XVI.

RESULTS OF THE INSURRECTIONS OF 1569—NEGOTIATIONS AT CHATSWORTH.

	PAGE
Complaints of Elizabeth,	2
Her grief for the Regent Murray,	3
Parties in Scotland,	5
Randolph in Scotland,	6
Policy of Elizabeth,	8
Invasion of Scotland,	10
Elizabeth excommunicated,	12
Lennox regent,	14
Results of Elizabeth's policy,	16
Proposed negotiations,	17
Elizabeth in Council,	18
Cecil and Mary,	20
Proposals of Cecil,	22
The rebel lords in Scotland,	24
Cecil and Lennox,	27
Opinion of Maitland,	28
Conduct of Elizabeth,	29
Suspicions of Mary,	32
Her enemies in Scotland,	33
Ridolphi,	34
Morton in London,	35
Device of Walsingham,	37
Indecision of Elizabeth,	38
Negotiations broken off,	40

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CONSPIRACY OF RIDOLPHI.

Elizabeth and Philip,	44
Ridolphi and the Duke of Norfolk,	46

Their plans, ... 48
Instructions of Ridolphi, ... 50
Letter of Mary, ... 51
Ridolphi and Alva, ... 52
Ridolphi at Madrid, ... 54
The Bishop of Ross, ... 56
Sir John Hawkins, ... 57
And Lord Burghley, ... 59
Their joint scheme, ... 60
Its success, ... 61
Fresh arrests, ... 65
Norfolk in the Tower, ... 66
Prospects of Mary, ... 67
Instructions of Burghley, ... 68
Mary and her keepers, ... 69
Fresh restrictions, ... 71
Mary and her servants, ... 72
Elizabeth and her ministers, ... 75
Treatment of Mary, ... 76
Hostility of Burghley, ... 78
A Christmas gift, ... 80
Buchanan's libel, ... 81
Arrest of the Bishop of Ross, ... 83
The bishop and the Regent Murray, ... 85
The Spanish ambassador, ... 86
Affairs in Scotland, ... 89
Capture of Dumbarton, ... 90
Archbishop Hamilton, ... 92
A Parliament at Stirling, ... 94
Death of Lennox, ... 96

CHAPTER XVIII.

NORFOLK AND NORTHUMBERLAND.

Decision as to Norfolk, ... 99
He is arraigned at Westminster, ... 100
The charge against him, ... 102
Evidence produced against him, ... 104
Opinion of Cecil, ... 106
The mission of Ridolphi, ... 109
Defence of Norfolk, ... 110
Witnesses called, ... 112
Sentence of death, ... 114
Political sermons, ... 116
Execution of Norfolk, ... 117
Debates in Parliament, ... 118
Schemes of Leicester, ... 120

New charges against Mary, ... 121
Her reply, ... 122
Northumberland at Lochleven, ... 124
He is surrendered, ... 126
Parsimony of Elizabeth, ... 128
Confession of Northumberland, ... 129
He is executed at York, ... 131

CHAPTER XIX.

EVENTS IN FRANCE AND IN SCOTLAND.

Parties in Scotland, ... 133
Affairs in France, ... 135
Charles and Coligni, ... 136
Margaret of Valois, ... 137
Schemes of Catherine, ... 138
Coligni is wounded, ... 139
The meditated massacre, ... 141
The king's consent obtained, ... 142
The explosion, ... 144
Its effects in England and Scotland, ... 145
New scheme of Burghley, ... 146
Killigrew sent to Scotland, ... 148
His negotiations there, ... 150
Sudden death of the Earl of Mar, ... 152
Knox and Kirkaldy, ... 154
Knox and Maitland, ... 156
Character of Maitland, ... 158
Death of Knox, ... 162
Morton elected regent, ... 164
His policy, ... 165
Treaty of Perth, ... 166
Advice of Killigrew, ... 168
Siege of Edinburgh Castle, ... 170
Death of Maitland, ... 172
And of Kirkaldy, ... 173
Mary and her keeper, ... 174
Morton and the Crown jewels, ... 176

CHAPTER XX.

THE REGENCY OF MORTON.

Mary visits Buxton, ... 177
Religion of Elizabeth and Mary, ... 178
Presents of Mary to Elizabeth, ... 182
Killigrew again sent to Scotland, ... 183
Confession of Bothwell, ... 186

Don John of Austria, ... 188
His arrival in the Netherlands, ... 190
Leicester at Buxton, ... 192
William the Silent and Don John, ... 194
War in the Netherlands, ... 195
Death of Don John, ... 197
New scheme of Morton, ... 198
His overtures to Mary, ... 199
His unpopularity, ... 201
Atholl and Argyll, ... 203
Murder of Atholl, ... 205
Persecutions of the Hamiltons, ... 206
Esmé Stewart, ... 207
Sir Robert Bowes in Scotland, ... 208
Plot against Esmé Stewart, ... 210
Position of Morton, ... 212
He is accused of Darnley's murder, ... 213
He is arrested, ... 214
Intrigues in his favour, ... 216
Forgeries by Archibald Douglas, ... 218
Evidence against Morton, ... 219
He is executed, ... 220

CHAPTER XXI.

PERSECUTIONS AND PLOTS IN ENGLAND—FRESH TROUBLES IN SCOTLAND.

Persecution of the Catholics, ... 223
Its results, ... 225
Policy of Lord Burghley, ... 226
His prudence, ... 228
The Duke of Alençon, ... 229
John Stubbs, ... 231
Plans of Mary's friends, ... 232
Character of her son, ... 234
Beale at Sheffield Castle, ... 235
Views of Elizabeth, ... 237
Projects of the Duke of Guise, ... 238
Views of Mary, ... 240
Edmund Campian, ... 242
Affairs in Scotland, ... 244
The Raid of Ruthven, ... 246
Arran a prisoner, ... 247
Flight and death of Lennox, ... 248
Death of Buchanan, ... 249
Letter of Mary, ... 250
Her proposals, ... 254
Opinion of the Council, ... 256

French diplomacy, ... 257
Escape of James, ... 258
Attitude of Mary, ... 259
Views of Walsingham, ... 260
He is sent to Scotland, ... 261
Plans of the Duke of Guise, ... 262
Francis Throgmorton, ... 265
Expulsion of Mendoza, ... 266
Arrest of the Earl of Gowrie, ... 268
Gowrie and the casket, ... 270

CHAPTER XXII.

ARRAN AND THE MASTER OF GRAY.

Position of Arran, ... 272
Lord Seton in France, ... 273
Arran and Hunsdon, ... 275
The Master of Gray, ... 277
Fresh negotiations, ... 279
Murder of the Prince of Orange, ... 281
Fresh scandals against Mary, ... 282
The Countess of Shrewsbury, ... 284
Mary quits Sheffield, ... 288
Thomas Philipps, ... 289
The Bond of Association, ... 292
Gray in London, ... 294
His treachery, ... 295
Mary sent to Tutbury, ... 297
Treason of Parry, ... 298
Thomas Morgan, ... 302
Scenes at Tutbury, ... 303
Mary deserted by her son, ... 305

CHAPTER XXIII.

LEAGUE BETWEEN ELIZABETH AND JAMES—INTERVENTION IN THE NETHERLANDS.

Plans of Gray, ... 307
Archibald Douglas, ... 311
Angus and his friends, ... 312
Treaty of Berwick, ... 315
War with Spain, ... 31[illegible]
Alexander Farnese, ... 31[illegible]
Fall of Antwerp, ... 31[illegible]
Leicester in the Netherlands, ... 32[illegible]

Secret negotiations, ... 323
Sir Amias Paulet, ... 325
Mary sent to Chartley, ... 328

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE BABINGTON CONSPIRACY.

The Council of Castile, ... 330
Schemes of Parma, ... 331
And of Mary, ... 332
Gilbert Gifford, ... 334
The Burton brewer, ... 336
Arthur Gregory, ... 338
Anthony Babington, ... 341
His companions, ... 342
Letter of Morgan, ... 344
Paulet and Philipps, ... 346
Letter of Babington, ... 348
General remarks, ... 353
Walsingham and Gifford, ... 355
Philipps at Chartley, ... 357
Mary's letter to Babington, ... 359
The postscript, ... 369
Letter of Philipps, ... 371
Letter of Gifford, ... 376
Practices of Philipps, ... 380
Arrest of Babington, ... 382
Confession of Savage, ... 384
Wade sent to Chartley, ... 385
Mary's papers seized, ... 386
Her secretaries arrested, ... 389
Their alleged confessions, ... 390
Memorial of Nau, ... 393
Burghley to Hatton, ... 396
Trial of Babington, ... 397
And his accomplices, ... 399
Babington's confession, ... 402
He is executed, ... 403
As are also his companions, ... 405

CHAPTER XXV.

FOTHERINGAY.

The Scottish Catholics, ... 409
Consultations as to Mary, ... 411

Final resolution, ... 412
Elizabeth writes to Mary, ... 415
Mary's answer, ... 416
Burghley and Hatton, ... 418
Mary's protest, ... 421
She accuses Walsingham, ... 423
Burghley and the Crown counsel, ... 427
Appeal of Mary, ... 428
Proceedings in the Star Chamber, ... 430
A Parliament, ... 432
Mary's letter to Elizabeth, ... 436
And to the Duke of Guise, ... 437
Conduct of Paulet, ... 440
Attitude of Elizabeth, ... 444
And of the French king, ... 445
James and the Master of Gray, ... 448
Gray in London, ... 450
Elizabeth and Davison, ... 452
She signs the warrant, ... 454
Correspondence with Paulet, ... 456
The warrant read to Mary, ... 459
Her conversation with Gorion, ... 462
Final preparations, ... 465
The Dean of Peterborough, ... 466
Mary's last prayer, ... 467

CHAPTER XXVI.

RESULTS OF MARY'S DEATH.

Conduct of Elizabeth, ... 470
Her apologies to James, ... 473
And to the King of France, ... 477
Plans of Philip, ... 478
Credulity of Burghley, ... 479
The Spanish Armada, ... 480
Arrives in Calais Roads, ... 482
Is dispersed and defeated, ... 484
Good fortune of Elizabeth, ... 485

CHAPTER XXVII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS, ... 488

APPENDIX.

A. Letter of the Duke of Norfolk, &c., to Queen Elizabeth, . 497
B. Letters and papers from the Scots College in Paris, . . 502
C. Letters of Henry Killigrew, ... 565
D. Memoir of Bothwell, ... 576
E. Sir A. Paulet to Walsingham, ... 598
F. Gilbert Gifford to Walsingham, ... 602
G. Essay by Queen Mary, ... 604

Sonnets in the handwriting of Queen Mary, preserved in the Bodleian Library, ... *to face page* 1

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS,

AND HER ACCUSERS.

CHAPTER XVI.

RESULTS OF THE INSURRECTIONS OF 1569—NEGOTIATIONS AT CHATSWORTH.

THE two northern rebellions, which during their progress had filled the kingdom with alarm, proved in the end extremely advantageous to Elizabeth. The rapidity with which both were suppressed taught her enemies, as well at home as abroad, that she was much more securely seated on her throne than they had been led to believe; and the condition of the disaffected counties furnished her, moreover, with an additional pretext for the continued detention of the Queen of Scots. In reply to the remonstrances of foreign Powers on behalf of that princess, she could now assert, with some show of plausibility, that she had afforded her a shelter from her enemies, and that the Scottish queen had repaid her hospitality by

stirring up rebellion among her subjects, by inviting foreign mercenaries to invade her kingdom, and by openly seeking to deprive her of her crown.[1]

But these allegations were wholly untrue. Mary would no doubt have been justified in encouraging the rising of the northern lords. Being forcibly detained in captivity, in defiance of all law and reason, she had an unquestionable right to resort to force for her deliverance. But far from encouraging the insurrections in the north, we know that she did her best to prevent them. Being in constant correspondence with the Duke of Norfolk at this time, and acting entirely by his advice, she even sent a messenger to Northumberland to dissuade him from his rash and ill-concerted enterprise; but, unfortunately for him as well as for herself, without effect.[2]

[1] Instructions to Norris, in Digges, p. 9 *et seq.*

[2] See the examination of Hamelin, a retainer of Northumberland; Haynes, 595. The same witness stated that "Havers came to the two earls in Topcliffe Park, from the Duke of Norfolk, willing them not to rise, for if they did the duke should be in danger."—Ibid., 596. On the trial of the duke, Richard Cavendish stated that while he was conversing with the duke, shortly before the rebellion, on the subject of his marriage with the Scottish queen, Norfolk turned to him and said, "Cavendish, nothing will undo us but the rising of the northern lords." —State Trials, i. 998. We have further proof that Mary was at this time acting entirely under the guidance of Norfolk. When she was residing for a short time at Wingfield Manor, a house belonging to the Earl of Shrewsbury, in the autumn of 1569, a plan for her escape was devised by Leonard Dacre in conjunction with Sir Thomas and Sir Edward Stanley, sons of the Earl of Derby, Sir Thomas Gerard, and other gentlemen of Lancashire. Dacre was to arrange all details at Wingfield, and his friends were to provide relays of horses at stated distances until they reached the Scottish Border. Mary refused to sanction the scheme until she consulted Norfolk, and in consequence of his disapproval it was abandoned. The plan promised to be successful, as Mary was by no means strictly guarded at this time, and Norfolk seems to have set his face against it from purely selfish motives. On the one hand he was jealous of the prominent part which Dacre was to act in

We have seen that previous to his death the position of the Regent Murray had become precarious in the extreme. The party of the queen was, notwithstanding all his efforts, so decidedly in the ascendant, that he had adopted the desperate expedient of seeking that she should be delivered into his hands. What was his purpose we can only guess; and it is worthy of note that Elizabeth bewailed his death in a manner which leads us to suspect that the derangement of some cherished project, through that event, added poignancy and passion to her sorrow. Murray had undertaken to relieve her of her dangerous guest; she had acceded to his terms; and just as the bargain was struck, and a source of intolerable anxiety and peril was about to be removed, she was doomed to sudden disappointment.[1]

the enterprise, and on the other he feared that the Scottish queen might be carried over to the Netherlands, and might there be induced to contract a Spanish marriage.—Murdin, 20, 32, 36.

[1] "Il n'est pas à croire," says Fénelon, "combien la reine d'Angleterre a vivement senti la morte du comte de Murray, pour laquelle s'étant enfermée dans sa chambre, elle s'est écriée qu'elle avait perdu le meilleur et le plus utile ami qu'elle eût au monde pour l'aider à se maintenir et conserver en repos; et en a pris un si grand ennui, que le comte de Leicester a été contraint de lui dire qu'elle faisait tort à sa grandeur, de montrer que sa sûreté et celle de son état eussent à dépendre d'un seul homme."—Fénelon, iii. 54. There is in the Record Office a curious letter from Sir Francis Englefield, a strong partisan of the Scottish queen, to the Duchess of Feria, an Englishwoman, who had married her husband in the reign of Mary Tudor, which may throw some light on the scheme of Elizabeth and Murray, which was abandoned on the regent's death. "The Queen of Scotland," says Sir Francis, "continues prisoner at Tutbury. She had been delivered into James's (the regent's) hands, or worse, conveyed away, if he had not been slain. She was, under pretence of favour, to be carried about to see the country, and take recreation after her long restraint, and by hunting and hawking from place to place brought near to Bristol, where she could have been embarked by force at night; and in the morning her keepers and guard were to make an outcry, and raise the country and pursue her,

In Scotland the death of the regent was lamented only by his own adherents. When the news reached Fernihirst, we learn that the Earl of Westmoreland tossed his hat in the fire in a paroxysm of joy.[1] On the very same night, and doubtless with a headpiece of different materials, he crossed the Border, accompanied by his host and the Laird of Buccleuch. With a formidable array of moss-troopers they swept through Northumberland, plundering and ravaging the country in the most ruthless manner.[2] It was little to the credit of Westmoreland, the representative of the most potent baronial house ever known in England, that he should have joined—if indeed he did not instigate—this destructive foray against his countrymen. But the Tudors were not famed for clemency; and the terrible retribution inflicted on the northern counties after the late rebellion, taught him that he could look for no mercy from Elizabeth. His probable object, therefore, was to involve her in a war with Scotland, in which France or Spain, on political or religious grounds, might be induced to join, with the view of

saying she was run away into France. Then the ship, some say, was to be drowned next night, the master and mariners escaping in a pinnace. The ship was on its way to Bristol when James (the regent) was slain, and was taken by two or three French ships that went to victual Dumbarton Castle, besieged by James's command. This talk comes from London, give it what credit you please."—Louvaine, April 1570.

This seems a strange and improbable story; but it is not so improbable as that Murray should have ventured to bring Mary to Scotland at this time when her partisans were so numerous and powerful. From the language of Murray and Knox it is obvious that they sought her life; and whatever we may think of the tale of the Bristol ship, we cannot but believe that the bargain concluded between the regent and Elizabeth would, but for the bullet of Bothwellhaugh, have been speedily followed by the murder of the Scottish queen.

[1] Hunsdon to Cecil, B. C., Jan. 30.

[2] Tytler, vii. 257.

restoring the ancient faith in Britain. Westmoreland was a desperate man, and it was only by the overthrow of his sovereign that he could hope to retrieve his ruined fortunes.

In Scotland, meanwhile, the exasperation of the rival factions threatened every day to break into open strife. The great bulk of the nobility and gentry were at this time ranged on the side of the queen. In the north, Huntly and his younger brother, Sir Adam Gordon,[1] with the Lord Ogilvie, were masters of the whole country beyond the Tay. In the southern counties the numerous adherents of Chatelherault and Herries far outnumbered the partisans of the infant king. Argyll once more declared for the party of the queen, and her friends held both Edinburgh and Dumbarton Castles. We may add that now, as formerly at Langside, the most prominent of her supporters were Protestants. Chatelherault and Herries, Huntly and Argyll, Kirkaldy and Maitland, and Lord Fleming, the governor of Dumbarton Castle, were all Reformers—a further proof, if proof were wanting, that the tolerant spirit invariably displayed by Mary had convinced the most powerful of her Protestant subjects that their religion was in no danger at her hands.

It required all the energy of the opposite faction to make head against so formidable a combination. But the Earl of Morton, with Macgill, an able lawyer, and Pitcairn, lay abbot of Dunfermline, exerted themselves to the utmost on behalf of the adherents of the late regent. Knox, although declining in health and strength, became more fierce in his denunciations of

[1] His life had been spared after his father's rebellion. *Ante*, vol. i. 88.

the queen the more the number of her partisans increased; and in the towns, his influence, and that of his brethren, was still immense. Among the nobility, the chief supporters of Morton were,—Lennox the grandfather, and Mar the guardian, of the king; with Glencairn, Lindsay, and Ruthven, who represented the more fanatical section of the Reformers.

It had been determined, previous to the death of the regent, to send Randolph to Scotland to conclude the secret treaty respecting the disposal of the Queen of Scots,[1] and although that transaction was now at an end, Elizabeth could find no fitter instrument to work out her policy in the north than her old envoy. Randolph arrived in Edinburgh about a month after Murray's death; and the distracted state of the kingdom, divided by contending factions, and deprived even of the semblance of a Government, afforded him a still more tempting field for the exercise of his mischievous talents than he had ever before experienced. Instead of seeking to reconcile the opposing factions, he did his utmost to render all reconciliation impossible. By bribes and promises on the one hand to the party of the king, and by exaggerating on the other the dangers to be apprehended from the restoration of his mother,[2] he contrived day

[1] *Ante*, vol. i. 511, note.

[2] There was an elaborate minute written by Cecil, about this time, on the foreign relations of England, in which he expresses himself as follows: "The Queen of Scots strength standeth—

"1. By the universal opinion of the world for the justice of her title, as coming of the ancient line.

"2. By the countenance and power of the strongest monarchies of Christendom, who, after the conquests of their own, shall willingly attend to make a conquest for her.

"3. By the secret and great numbers of discontented subjects in this

by day to widen the breach between the rival parties, and to provoke them to open warfare. At a meeting at Dalkeith, Argyll, in the presence of Morton and Maitland, openly reproached Randolph with his treacherous conduct, who, elated apparently with the success of his intrigues, described the scene to Cecil in his own cynical and reckless way.[1] The arrival, however, of a French envoy, M. de Verac, at this time in Scotland, suddenly changed the aspect of affairs. The queen's party, already by far the most numerous, and relying on immediate aid from France, assumed a bolder tone. Chatelherault and Herries, who had been committed to the Castle of Edinburgh by the late regent, and who still remained prisoners, were liberated by Kirkaldy. Randolph, whose intrigues had created the utmost indignation among the partisans of the queen, was compelled to fly to Berwick,[2] where he

realm, that gape and practice for a change by her means, to be rewarded by her.

"4. By the probable opinion of great multitudes, both in Scotland and England, that have an earnest, and, as it were, a natural instinction to have both these realms under one king or head, by means of the said Queen of Scots."—Haynes, 580.

[1] Randolph to Cecil, 1st March; Record Office. Melvill, who was in Scotland at the time, after describing the intrigues of Randolph, goes on to say: "Now, as Nero stood upon a high part of Rome to see the town burning, which he had caused to be set on fire, so Mr Randolph delighted to see such a fire by his craft kindled in Scotland, which was in all probability like to burn it up; and in his letters to some of the Court of England, he gloried that he had kindled a fire in Scotland which could not be easily extinguished. Which, when it came to the knowledge of Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, he wrote to my brother Sir Robert and me, advertising us how we were handled, expressing his detestation both of Secretary Cecil, director, and Mr Randolph as executor. All the honest men in England were sorry at it, *of which number there are as many within that country as in any other*," &c. —Memoirs, 109.

[2] Tytler, vii. 268.

had sought refuge four years before for a similar cause; and a convention of the whole nobility was summoned to meet at Linlithgow, to deliberate on the affairs, and to provide for the government of the realm.

Justly alarmed at the discomfiture of Randolph, and the defiant attitude assumed by the adherents of the queen, Cecil and his mistress saw that unless they were prepared to abandon the policy which they had pursued in Scotland during the past ten years, immediate steps must be taken to counteract the influence of France, and to maintain the party of the infant king. Diplomacy had been tried in vain, and a resort to arms would probably involve an immediate war with France. But circumstances at this time gave Elizabeth and her ministers a plausible pretext for accomplishing their purpose without a formal declaration of hostilities. The marauding expedition of Fernihirst, Buccleuch, and Westmoreland had been wholly unprovoked, and, under the pretence of punishing its leaders, it was determined to crush the chief supporters of Queen Mary in the south of Scotland. Sussex and Scrope, who commanded in the northern counties, had still a large force at their disposal, collected from all parts of the kingdom, to guard against any fresh rising in that quarter; and they were ordered to cross the Border at different points and inflict summary vengeance on the Scots. The proceeding, like many others in the reign of Elizabeth, was altogether anomalous. A proclamation, very artfully framed for the occasion, was issued in the name of the English Government. The real object of the expedition was declared to be the punishment of the English rebels, who, sheltered by Border outlaws, had traitorously

invaded their own country. It was only against her own subjects, and those who, in breach of the treaties between the two countries, aided and abetted them in their treason, that the arms of the Queen of England were to be employed. She therefore emphatically disclaimed all hostile intentions against the people of Scotland, and, in proof of the assertion, she appealed to "the wise, noble, and godly" of that realm. She reminded them how, ten years before, she had rescued them from the tyranny of France without seeking the smallest recompense for all the sacrifices she had made on their behalf. All reference to the state of parties in Scotland was carefully avoided in this very able document. There was no allusion to the peculiar position of the queen, and the authority of her son was neither rejected nor recognised. Elizabeth, in short, had no quarrel with any one except with her own rebellious subjects, and with those who, in defiance of treaties, protected and maintained them in rebellion.[1]

But the language of the English queen, however plausible, deceived no one. Mary saw clearly that the ruin of her friends in Scotland was the true object of the expedition, and she earnestly besought the King of France to interfere in her behalf. She truly described the intended invasion as having been determined upon "to defend and strengthen her rebels, and to oppress and ruin, so far as possible, her good and faithful subjects, under colour of recovering the English rebels who had fled to Scotland."[2] Fénelon, who knew that the partisans of Mary had never been so

[1] Bannatyne's Memorials, 35.

[2] See her letter to Fénelon; Labanoff, iii. 38.

numerous and powerful since her deposition,[1] was entirely of the same opinion; and he remonstrated energetically with Elizabeth against the projected expedition, and even hinted at the probable interference of France if an English army crossed the Border. At this threat Elizabeth affected to be highly indignant; but she denied that she cherished any hostile intentions against the Queen of Scots, and, in the language of her proclamation, repeated with all solemnity that her sole object was the punishment of her rebels, and of those who had abetted them in their treason.[2]

About the middle of April, accordingly, Sussex entered Teviotdale with an army of 7000 men. The inhabitants fled on his approach, and he forthwith proceeded to lay waste to the country with a deliberation unknown before in Border warfare. Twenty-two years had elapsed since a hostile English army had crossed the Cheviots, but even the havoc committed by Somerset fell short of that which now converted into a desert nearly the whole valley of the Tweed.[3] Sir John

[1] On the 31st of March, Fénelon wrote to Charles IX. that only four of the principal nobility of Scotland were opposed to the queen. These were probably Lennox, Morton, Mar, and Glencairn.—Dépêches, iii. 105.

[2] Fénelon, iii., and Digges, 9.

[3] We have from Robert Constable, the spy who accompanied the expedition, a detailed account of its progress. He says they entered Scotland on the 17th of April, "and did burn and spoil all along the river Rule and the water of Cale, and encamped that night at Jedburgh. The next morning he (Lord Sussex) marched to Fernihirst, and overthrew it; and so burned and spoiled all along the river of Teviot; and so to Hawick and burned and spoiled it. The next day he overthrew the strong house of the Lord of Buccleuch, called Branksome, and thence to Bedrule, a house of Sir Andrew Turnbull, and overthrew it; and divers other notable towers and houses all along those rivers aforenamed. The next day we retired to Jedburgh, where we encamped again. The next morning we dislodged and burnt all the country

Foster with another force invaded the eastern Border; and Lord Scrope, Warden of the Western Marches, crossed the Esk, and advanced towards Dumfries with 3000 men. On the eastern Border there was no attempt at resistance. The people retired to the moors and morasses with such articles of property as they could carry along with them, and the torch and the axe were unsparingly applied to their habitations, whether in town or country. But the Maxwells, Johnstones, and other Border septs, mustered in sufficient force to attack Lord Scrope—but for which incident Dumfries must have shared the fate of Hawick and Jedburgh. As it was, Scrope was content, after repelling the attack, to make the best of his way back to Carlisle, carrying off with him all the sheep and cattle of the district upon which he could lay his hands.[1]

Having committed herself thus far, Sussex,[2] as well as Cecil and Bacon, strongly recommended Elizabeth to declare openly for the party of the young king. But in spite of all their efforts, she still affected to regard Morton and his friends as rebels; and still assured the French ambassador that she was not at war with Scotland,[3] but had only punished the Border outlaws,

along the river of Bowbank, and burnt and spoiled the whole country as we marched; and came back that night to Kelso. The number of the towns and villages by estimation was above 500."—Constable to the Earl of Shrewsbury, 5th May 1580; Lodge, i. 508.

[1] In a letter to Cecil, he says that Simon Musgrave, whom he had appointed to command his horse, was attacked near Cockpool by Lords Maxwell and Carlisle, and the Lairds of Holmends, Closeburn, Lagg, Hempsfield (Amisfield), Cowhill, and Tinoll (Tinwald), who, with the number of four hundred horsemen and six hundred footmen, "charged them very sore." He adds that Musgrave held his ground until he was able to come up to his assistance.—Cabala, 176.

[2] See his letters in Record Office of 23d April to Elizabeth and Cecil.

[3] Fénelon, 3d May 1580; iii. 133.

who were the enemies of both countries; and that she had both the wish and the intention to restore Mary Stewart to her throne. There were two incidents, however, which happened about this time to throw her into a state of extreme excitement and irritation against the Scottish queen. The first was the appearance of the "Defence of Queen Mary's Honour," by the Bishop of Ross,[1] in which the most serious charges were made against Elizabeth and her ministers; and the second was the publication of the bull of Pope Pius V. against the Queen of England, a copy of which was found on the 15th May affixed to the gate of the Bishop of London's house.[2] Although the thunders of the Vatican could no longer, as in the days of Hildebrand or of Innocent III., shake the proudest thrones in Christendom, Elizabeth felt the blow as a deep indignity; and the more so, as she strongly suspected that it was in reality inflicted by her rival. To be publicly branded as an excommunicated heretic, and to be henceforth regarded as such by all true Catholics, was gall and wormwood to a princess who was only a Protestant from necessity, and whose hatred of innovation and love of arbitrary power, but for the accident of her birth, would certainly have inclined her to the ancient faith. It was soon discovered that the copy of the bull had been affixed on the Bishop of London's house by an enthusiast named Felton, who, according to the fashion of the age, was

[1] The bishop asserted, as Mary herself had emphatically declared, and as even Elizabeth believed, the letters produced by Morton at Westminster to be forgeries.—See his "Defence of Queen Mary's Honour," by John Leslie, Bishop of Ross, in Anderson's Collections.

[2] Camden, 125.

first barbarously tortured, and afterwards tried and executed as a traitor.[1]

The irritation produced in the mind of Elizabeth by the Papal bull and the publication of Bishop Leslie's book, was artfully inflamed by Cecil and his colleagues. The work of crushing Mary's friends in Scotland had only been half done. Although signal vengeance had been taken on the Borderers, Westmoreland, Dacre, and other of the English rebels, had found a new refuge with the Hamiltons, who, jointly with their guests and the other partisans of Mary, were gathering up their strength for a fresh effort. It had become necessary therefore, Cecil assured his mistress, that a fresh inroad should be made into Scotland to chastise the Hamiltons and defeat the schemes of the English rebels. Elizabeth, smarting under the indignities to which she believed — or affected to believe—the malice of her rival had subjected her, was induced to consent; and an army under the command of Sir William Drury marched from Berwick to Linlithgow, where Mary's adherents were assembled, and who at the time were unprepared for this fresh attack. Chatelherault, with Westmoreland, fled to the Highlands; and, in obedience to his orders, Drury levelled to the ground the houses of the duke at Linlithgow and Kinneil. His lands and those of his kinsmen were laid waste in the most approved fashion, and Cecil boasted that the Hamiltons "had never had such losses in all the wars betwixt England and Scotland these forty years."[2]

During all this time Scotland was still without a

[1] Camden, 128. [2] Cabala, 178.

Government; but Lennox, the hereditary enemy of the Hamiltons, had accompanied Drury in his expedition to Linlithgow, and had exerted himself to the utmost in promoting the work of vengeance. He wrote exultingly to Cecil describing the havoc he had witnessed, entreated him to give orders for assaulting Dumbarton Castle, and begged a little money for himself.[1] Randolph, who knew well the pliant and servile nature of the man, had already pointed him out as the most eligible candidate for the regency; and at a convention held at Edinburgh on the 12th of July, Lennox was accordingly elected to that office by the chiefs of the king's faction. Kirkaldy, who held the castle for the queen, might have laid the Tolbooth in ashes while the election was going on. But he contented himself by refusing to be present, although he was formally invited, and by forbidding any guns to be fired on the proclamation of the new regent.[2] There were only four earls present on the occasion—namely, Morton, Mar, Glencairn, and Angus, who was still a minor. The Hamiltons, the Gordons, and the Campbells, with all their following, not only stood aloof, but declared that they would hold a Parliament in the queen's name at Linlithgow on the 4th of August, and that they would never acknowledge the authority of the new regent.[3]

War between the rival factions was now inevitable, and the attitude of the queen's adherents now con-

[1] Tytler, vii. 270.

[2] See letter of Maitland to Archbishop Beaton; Appendix B.

[3] Instructions by Lennox to Nicolas Elphinstone, July 23; Record Office.

vinced Lennox that without help from England it would be impossible for him to maintain his post. Huntly was at Aberdeen in the midst of his vassals, and in daily expectation of supplies from France. Argyll and the Hamiltons were mustering in the west; and the whole of the Border chiefs, from Berwick to Dumfries, were burning for revenge. Sussex, who still commanded in the north, knew—or at least believed—that the triumph of the queen's party in Scotland would prove most dangerous to his mistress. As one of the commissioners at York, he had pointed out that if the Scots united in demanding the restoration of their queen, Elizabeth could not but comply. He had therefore recommended, in the supposed interest of England, that every means should be taken to prevent a reconciliation between the Scottish factions; and we have seen that both at York and at Westminster[1] his Machiavellian advice was followed to the letter.

When, therefore, at this juncture he received orders to ravage the west Borders "very secretly,"[2] under the pretext that Leonard Dacre was concealed in that quarter, he well knew the object of his superiors. In consequence of the resistance which Scrope had met, the west Border had suffered comparatively little in the recent invasion; but, in obedience to his orders, Sussex speedily redressed the balance between it and the east. Marching from Carlisle with 4000 men, he advanced rapidly to the neighbourhood of Dumfries, destroying every castle and place of strength on the Scottish side, and returning to his quarters on

[1] See his letter to Cecil; vol. i., Appendix A.
[2] Draft by Cecil, July 26; Record Office.

the sixth day after his departure. Lennox, meanwhile, had not been idle. Accompanied by Morton, he marched against the queen's forces in the north, and it speedily became apparent that humanity was not one of the virtues of the new regent. Having succeeded in capturing Brechin Castle, he forthwith ordered thirty-four men of the garrison to be hanged in front of his own house.[1]

It is impossible to condemn too strongly the perfidious policy of Elizabeth in Scotland during the six months which followed the death of the Regent Murray. At that time the whole country desired the restoration of the queen. If we are to believe Maitland, Knox alone was opposed to her return. But Elizabeth, at the instigation of her ministers, had committed a great crime. She had induced, by friendly messages and promises of aid, her nearest kinswoman to seek a refuge in her dominions from her enemies, and in defiance of every principle of honour and humanity, she had confined her in a prison. After inflicting upon her so grievous a wrong, could she with safety restore her to her throne? Cecil and his colleagues replied emphatically in the negative; and the fears and the remorse of their mistress were instruments upon which they worked incessantly, to bend her to their purpose. Hence Randolph was sent down to Scotland to kindle afresh the flames of civil war; hence Sussex, Scrope, and Drury were let loose against the partisans of the Scottish queen; hence Lennox was appointed regent, and the whole country from north to south presented one dismal scene of anarchy and bloodshed.

It was not to be expected that Mary should remain

[1] Spottiswoode, ii. 37; Correspondence of Randolph in Record Office.

an unmoved spectator of the wrongs and sufferings of her country; and her energetic appeals to the Kings of France and Spain at length induced Elizabeth to pause in her career of treachery and violence. There were strong reasons why the remonstrances of Charles IX. should not be disregarded. In the first place, a fresh treaty, destined soon to share the fate of its predecessors, had been concluded between the Huguenots and the Catholics at St Germains;[1] and about the same time the Duke of Anjou, the favourite son of Catherine de Medici, had been induced, much against his will, to make an offer of marriage to Elizabeth. What her real sentiments were on the subject, it is impossible to say; but that she was flattered by the proposal is certain, and the friendly intercourse thus opened up between the Courts led eventually to negotiations being commenced for the restoration of the Scottish queen.

It was impossible, indeed, that this concession to the public opinion of Europe could be longer delayed. Elizabeth had virtually declared, at the termination of the Westminster conferences, that the Queen of Scots was guiltless of the charges brought against her by her rebellious subjects. No proof was ever offered that she had directly or indirectly encouraged the insurrections in the north, yet under one pretext or another she was still detained a prisoner.

When the question of her restoration was first mooted in the Council, the project was vehemently opposed by the Lord Keeper Bacon, who bluntly declared that, rather than allow her to be reinstated by the aid of France, he would cut off her head with

[1] On the 8th August 1570.

his own hands.[1] Language so strong was rarely heard at the council board, except from Elizabeth herself. But the licence in which she was wont to indulge did not extend to her ministers, and she sharply rebuked the Lord Keeper for a sentiment which foreshadowed only too truly the final doom of the Scottish queen. Cecil, although too discreet to offend his mistress by any unseemly show of violence, was, if possible, still more hostile to the project than his colleague. But the Lord Keeper and the Secretary were opposed in the Council by Arundel and Leicester—by the former from real sympathy with Mary, and by the latter from subservience to the presumed wishes of his mistress. Elizabeth was as usual perplexed amidst the conflicting opinions of her ministers; but, whatever may have been her true sentiments on the subject, she had committed herself too far in her correspondence with the Duke of Anjou to recede from her promises to the French ambassador; and it was finally determined, to the great disgust of Cecil,[2] that negotiations should be commenced with the view of replacing the Scottish queen on her throne.

It is worthy of note that, amid the warm discussions which preceded this decision, not a word was said by the enemies of Mary respecting her alleged complicity in the murder of her husband. It is obvious that if they could have relied upon the evidence produced at Westminster, a ready answer might have been furnished to all the representations of the French ambassador on her behalf. But we have seen

[1] Fénelon, iii. 181.

[2] "Sir Walter Mildmay and I are sent to the Scottish queen. God be our guide, for neither of us like the message."—Cabala, 179.

that, in spite of all his efforts, the contents of the silver casket had been persistently withheld from him.[1] All allusion to the subject, therefore, was carefully avoided by Elizabeth and her ministers; and instead of now accusing her of the murder of her husband, they shifted their ground, and alleged as the cause of her continued detention her complicity in the northern rebellions.[2] We have already stated that not only does no proof of this complicity exist, but that she, for very sufficient reasons, disapproved of the rash and ill-timed rising of the northern lords.

Elizabeth would intrust the conduct of the proposed negotiations to no one but to Cecil, and it was with much misgiving that he set out for Chatsworth to confront the woman he had so deeply wronged. But he had long persuaded himself that she was the mortal enemy of his mistress and his religion, and that her downfall was essential to the security of both. He was at length about to meet this dreaded adversary, who, although a fugitive and a prisoner, was formidable still, perhaps more formidable than ever. As to the real intentions and wishes of his mistress, he was wholly in the dark. It is indeed most probable that, independent of her relations with the French Court, she was at this time sincerely anxious to get rid of her dangerous guest.[3] She knew that her ministers

[1] See vol. i. 478.

[2] See Instructions to Norris, in Digges, 9.

[3] Catherine de Medici seems to have clearly understood the true state of the case. She plainly told Walsingham about this time that she knew it was not Elizabeth, but her ministers, who were responsible for the harsh treatment of the Queen of Scots; "and therefore," she added, "in wishing her liberty, I do it as much for the queen your mistress's quietness' sake as for any other respect, which without her liberty can

were of a different opinion; but she knew, besides, that in the eyes of Catholic Europe the responsibility and the odium of Mary's detention rested upon her. However she might dissemble to the world or to herself, she knew that her treatment of her cousin was wholly indefensible, and she would now have gladly escaped from the labyrinth in which she found herself involved.[1] But the effort was made too late. Her ministers had induced her, against her better judgment, to make a prisoner of the Scottish queen, and that false step once taken she struggled against its consequences in vain. Although she would have purchased back her peace of mind even by the unconditional freedom of her rival, there were influences at work, as well in Scotland as in England, which rendered that result politically impossible. Henceforth the two queens were to be involved in a struggle of life and death—a struggle which neither had sought, but which neither could now avoid, and in which, from its very nature, success was perhaps even more to be dreaded than defeat.

Cecil, accompanied by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Walter Mildmay, reached Chatsworth in the beginning of October; and it is much to be regretted that the secretary to whose unwearied industry history is so much indebted, has left no record of the

hardly grow unto her."—Letter of Walsingham, 28th August 1570; Digges, 7.

[1] Sir Walter Mildmay, who accompanied Cecil to Chatsworth, after enumerating the dangers arising from the detention of the Queen of Scots, concludes thus: "Finally, it is said that the queen's majesty, of her own disposition, *hath no mind to retain her, but is much unquieted therewith*, which is a thing greatly to be weighed."—Collection of records appended to Burnet's Hist. of Reformation, ii. 339, edit. 1715.

impressions produced upon him by this interesting visit. We learn, however, from another source, that even he was not proof against those indescribable powers of fascination which all men, and even all women, seem to have felt in the presence of the Scottish queen. The cold-blooded politician not only expressed a most favourable opinion of her mental qualities and disposition, but even ventured to speak with secret approval of the Norfolk marriage, although it was absolutely necessary to keep the matter in the background for the present.[1] What amount of sincerity was contained in these professions it is impossible to say; but we cannot doubt that Mary sought at this time to produce a favourable impression on Elizabeth's most powerful minister; and when we bear in mind that she was not yet twenty-eight years old, with her beauty still undimmed, and with reviving hopes of freedom to stimulate her efforts, it would have been remarkable if she had altogether failed.

But although ready to make any concession compatible with honour to obtain her liberty, Mary convinced Cecil at the outset of the negotiations that the monotonous existence to which she had been condemned for the last three years had in no degree weakened her powers of intellect or tamed down her independent spirit. Before Cecil's arrival it had been proposed, as a preliminary step, that Edinburgh and Dumbarton Castles should be placed in the hands of Elizabeth; but Mary replied at once that she would listen to no such conditions. She was in the Queen of England's power, and she might do with her what she pleased; but never should it be said that she had

[1] Bishop Ross to Norfolk, Oct. 11; Record Office, Mary Queen of Scots.

brought into bondage the realm of which she was the lawful princess.[1]

Cecil did not venture to renew this offensive proposition, but proceeded to submit certain articles for the acceptance of the captive queen, the most important of which we shall shortly lay before the reader.

The treaty of Edinburgh, artfully framed by Cecil himself, ten years before, for the express purpose of excluding Mary and her descendants from the English succession, had never yet, for obvious reasons, been ratified by her. Cecil had overreached himself in his anxiety to gain his point, but he now consented to the removal of the words which would for ever have barred the claims of the house of Stewart. He proposed, instead, that Mary should not be barred from any right or title that she had, "if God shall not give to the queen's majesty any issue of her body."

In assenting to this alteration Mary suggested that instead of "any issue," the words "any lawful issue" should be inserted.[2]

Whether this was a piece of feminine malice on the part of Mary, the temptation to give vent to which was under the circumstances too strong to be resisted, or whether it was prompted by the indiscreet zeal of the Bishop of Ross, who, along with Lord Livingstone, was allowed to attend her at Chatsworth during the negotiations, we do not know. But the insinuation that Elizabeth had, or might have, illegitimate children, was highly imprudent on the part of either. "It was made with no good intent," was the shrewd remark of Cecil. He nevertheless consented to make the required

[1] Randolph to Sussex, 14th August; Record Office.

[2] Haynes, 608.

alteration,[1] most probably from the conviction that his refusal might have enabled the friends of the Queen of Scots to assert that the imputation against her rival was well founded. We may venture to add, with reference to this delicate topic, that the Catholic scandals against Elizabeth seem to have no better foundation than the Protestant scandals against her rival. That both queens should be mercilessly assailed by the shafts of calumny was, in a rude and fanatical age, a penalty inseparable from their history and position. If, on the one hand, the grotesque partialities, which Elizabeth was in the habit of displaying towards her favourites, even in public, naturally gave rise to the grossest imputations; so, on the other, the murder of Darnley and the Bothwell marriage were incidents in the life of Mary never to be forgotten by her enemies; and that Philip[2] and his Council should lend a willing ear to every scandalous tale about the Queen of England was as much to be expected as that Knox and his disciples should assert that the Queen of Scots was guilty of every crime. The diplomatists of France and Spain formed a more charitable, and probably a truer, estimate of the private characters of both queens. Fénelon, himself a Catholic and by no means prejudiced in favour of Elizabeth, for no one has better described her systematic double dealing, acquits her in

[1] Cecil, instead of the words proposed, inserted, "by any lawful husband."

[2] Philip made an allowance of six crowns a-day to a young Englishman who arrived at Madrid in the year 1586, who called himself Arthur Dudley, and asserted that he was the son of Elizabeth and the Earl of Leicester. He was then said to be about twenty-seven years old. But beyond his own assertion we have no proof of the truth of his story.—See Ellis, 2d series, iii. 136.

the most explicit terms of all impropriety of conduct.[1] Castelnau, who was well acquainted with the English Court, has expressed himself to the same effect; and, stronger still, perhaps, than the positive testimony of Fénelon and Castelnau,[2] is the absolute silence of the Spanish ambassadors De Silva, D'Espés, and Mendoza, the two latter of whom were compelled to leave England in consequence of the discovery of their intrigues, and who were both on that account animated by the most intense hostility against Elizabeth.

Another important point of discussion between Cecil and the Scottish queen arose from the flight of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland into Scotland on the suppression of their rebellion. The secretary required that the two noblemen, along with the other English fugitives, should be delivered up. But to this demand Mary refused her assent in terms at once conciliatory and dignified. "The Queen of Scotland," she replied, "cannot think that it may stand with her honour to deliver those who are come for refuge within her country, as it were to enter them in place of execution." She therefore earnestly besought her sister to grant them her pardon; and if that were not to be obtained, she engaged that within a given time the fugitives should quit Scotland. Cecil, according to his instructions, insisted upon the unconditional surrender of the rebels; but Mary, although prepared to yield much for the recovery of her liberty, adhered to her resolution. She courteously but decidedly refused to give up to certain death the men who had sought

[1] "De tout qu'en sa court l'on ne voyt, qu'ung bon ordre; et elle y etre bien fort honorée et ententive en ses affaires," &c. — Fénelon, March 6, 1571.

[2] Castlenau Mem.

refuge in her dominions, for the reasons already given, and, she added, "for many more that may be better conceived than put in writing."[1]

But the most important of all the articles proposed by Cecil was the delivery of the Prince of Scotland into the hands of Elizabeth for his nurture and education. It was further proposed that the prince should be accompanied by certain Scottish lords, to be named by the Earl of Lennox and the Earl of Mar, and that the Queen of England should bind herself "that to her uttermost he should be favourably used and treated, and to all purposes as her majesty's nearest kinsman."[2]

It appears that the Duke of Norfolk was privately consulted respecting this project, and he strongly disapproved of it.[3] Fénelon was of the same opinion, and expressed it in very decided terms.[4] But in this instance Mary was induced to act in opposition to the advice of her friends, perhaps because she saw that unless she yielded to Elizabeth on this important point, all hope of a reconciliation was at an end; perhaps because on reflection she concluded that the life of her son was at least as safe in England as among the turbulent nobles of her native land. There was, perhaps, a stronger motive still, the yearning of the mother to see her only child, from whom she had been separated for upwards of four years. In one of her

[1] Haynes, 615.

[2] Ibid., 610.

[3] According to the deposition of Higford, one of the duke's retainers, the Bishop of Ross wrote to Norfolk on the subject. "But," he says, "as to these two points touching the delivery of her son, and the yielding up of certain castles and holds, my lord's advice was, that the Queen of Scots should in no wise consent either to the one or the other."—Murdin, 84.

[4] See his letter to Mary of 14th Nov. 1570; iii. 367.

replies to Cecil the warmth of the maternal instinct contrasts significantly with the cold language of diplomacy. "The queen's majesty of Scotland desires *most instantly* that she may see her son, whom she has not seen this long time."[1]

In addition to the surrender of her son, Mary agreed that a perpetual league, offensive and defensive, should be established between the two kingdoms; that all foreign troops should be sent out of Scotland within a month after the treaty was signed; that commissioners should be appointed to inquire into the disorders committed on the Marches; that measures should be taken to punish the murderers of Darnley and of the Regent Murray; and finally, she agreed not to contract marriage with any subject of England without the consent of the queen, nor with any other person without the consent of the States of Scotland.[2]

The terms thus proposed for the restoration of the Scottish queen were, under all the circumstances, not more stringent than might have been anticipated. The very harshness of the conditions seemed to furnish evidence of Elizabeth's sincerity, and the proceedings at Chatsworth were watched in Scotland with the utmost interest. The party of the queen, which, notwithstanding the destructive invasions of Sussex and Drury, was still the most powerful, anticipated a speedy triumph over their enemies; while the new regent and his adherents regarded with just alarm the prospect of her return to Scotland. He seems at the commencement of the conferences to have addressed Cecil on the subject, for we find the latter, on the 13th of October, assuring the regent

[1] Haynes, 615. [2] Ibid.

that there was no immediate cause for anxiety. He added that he had undertaken the mission to Chatsworth "much against his heart," and that "all he had done touching Scottish affairs was under protestation that it should be in the power of those whom the queen and regent should send in commission to *change, diminish, or augment the articles at pleasure.*" He therefore recommends that he should send some persons to represent him in England, "taking care that the persons he chose were constant and firm, and such as would not be won from him *nor from the cause.*"[1] It would appear from this letter that Mary had been discussing entirely in the dark the terms of her restoration. The two queens were the only parties to the articles produced by Cecil.[2] In the discussions to which they gave rise, no other authority was referred to, nor indeed could any other have been recognised by Mary. She had still to learn that the treaty which she had signed might yet be set aside by her enemies in Scotland, who, Cecil well knew, would not fail to avail themselves of the opportunity thus considerately afforded them.[3]

[1] Spottiswoode, ii. 143.

[2] The mode of their final ratification was distinctly provided for, as follows: "The contracts of the promises to be first conceived and concluded in writing, and with the hands and seals of *both the queens*, or of sufficient commissioners' hands, thereto authorised, as is accustomed between princes."—Haynes, 612.

[3] Mary signed the articles on the 16th of October 1570; and to these, as we have said, the only parties were the Queen of England and herself. But there follows a paper by Cecil bearing this ambiguous title—"Articles gathered out of a communication had with the Queen of Scots, for her subjects." The concluding passage of this paper is to the following effect: "All these premises are but conjecturally propounded, without the knowledge of the Earl of Lennox or any of the nobility joined with him, or without any particular understanding of the state and

By thus encouraging on the one hand the hopes of the Scottish queen, and on the other those of her enemies, the crafty secretary, unable as yet to fathom the real intentions of his mistress, might claim the friendship of whichever party proved successful in the end. But, although Cecil had done his best to reassure the regent, all in reality depended upon Elizabeth. If she now had had the courage and the wisdom to come to terms with Mary, Lennox, who had been raised to the regency solely through the influence of the English queen, would have remonstrated in vain. But she made no sign; and Maitland, who knew her better than she knew herself, and who was at this time in active correspondence with the Bishop of Ross, predicted with the utmost confidence that she would never of her own accord set Mary free.[1] Maitland felt assured that, however eager Elizabeth might be to escape from the dangerous dilemma in which her ministers had placed her, her fears would preponderate in the end; and that she would never of her own free-will restore to liberty and power a woman she had so irreparably wronged. On the close of the negotiations at Chatsworth, she had recourse to her usual expedient of procrastination, for which, in the present instance, the absence of commissioners on the part of the Regent Lennox furnished the excuse.

At length Pitcairn, the Abbot of Dunfermline, who

customs of the country; and, therefore, are to be altered, changed, or forborne, in part or in whole, as shall seem further meet and reasonable upon conference, to be had with any whom the said earl and his party shall send into England for that purpose, and others to be sent by the queen."—Haynes, 620. This paper is not signed by Mary, nor by any one on her behalf.

[1] Quoted by Froude; Hist. of England, x. 100.

acted as secretary to the Government of the regent, reached London towards the end of December. He was the bearer of a formal protest, for various reasons, against the restoration of the Scottish queen. One of these at least was new—Mary, it was alleged, had abdicated her crown at Lochleven, and she had since repudiated her abdication. No reliance, therefore, could be placed on any treaty or engagement she now might make, for "the Papists' maxim of not keeping faith with heretics, would serve her for a substitute to break all covenants, when she saw her time."[1] After some delay Elizabeth gave a formal audience to the emissary of Lennox at Hampton Court, and informed him that his instructions contained matters of importance which required further consideration, and therefore she "desired some men of credit to be directed into England, that an end might be put to that business." She added, by way of encouragement, that "she would not have the regent, or those of his party, to think that she intended to wrong them in any sort; for if they should make it appear that nothing was done by them but according to justice, she would side with them and maintain their quarrel."[2] This language, although reassuring on the one hand, was abundantly alarming on the other. The faction of which Lennox was the chief had proclaimed to the world, as the cause of the deposition of the Queen of Scots, that she had murdered her husband, and had intended to murder her child; and the evidence of these horrid charges had been produced in due form before Elizabeth and her ministers. She had pronounced it to be worthless at the time, and she now in

[1] Spottiswoode, ii. 147. [2] Ibid.

effect repeated her opinion; for, without even the faintest allusion to these accusations, she called afresh on the regent and his friends to justify their continued usurpation of their sovereign's authority. The Abbot of Dunfermline returned to Scotland with his ambiguous message, and Elizabeth spent the remainder of the winter in coquetting with the Duke of Anjou, whose suit was warmly supported by the Protestants of France, as well as by the queen-mother, who sought by means of this alliance to establish an effective counterpoise to the enormous power of Spain. Cecil, too, was in favour of the match; for if the queen had children, which might still be expected, the dangerous claims of the Queen of Scots, of which he never for a moment lost sight, would be effectually cut off. Sussex also cordially approved of the marriage; but after she had induced a prince who was young enough to be her son, to make her a formal offer of his hand —a result which she brought about by sending him a present of her picture—she began forthwith to change her mind. She continued, indeed, her friendly intercourse with the French ambassador, and in his presence made a point of appearing in her richest and gayest dresses. But she wearied her attendants with her incessant displays of frivolity and vanity—at times declaring that she would marry for the sake of her people, again expressing doubts whether so young a prince would prove a faithful husband, and then asserting with an oath that she would die a maiden queen.[1]

Mary, meanwhile, was very differently employed. We cannot suppose that she would have yielded to the

[1] Fénelon, iv. 230, 302; Lingard, vi. 124.

hard conditions imposed upon her, if she had not believed in the sincerity of Elizabeth; and that Elizabeth was as sincere in the business as it was in her nature to be is highly probable. The negotiations at Chatsworth had been concluded by the middle of October, and immediately afterwards Mary addressed a letter to her sister queen in the most affectionate terms, declaring that it was because she placed more reliance upon her than upon any other prince, that she had consented to place in her hands "the most precious jewel which God had given her, her sole comfort in this world,—her only son."[1] She further expressed an earnest hope that Elizabeth would grant her the favour of a personal interview before she quitted her dominions; and it is by no means improbable that a meeting of the two queens, which Mary all along so earnestly desired, might have changed the history of Britain. The character of Elizabeth was made up of inexplicable contradictions, and, notwithstanding her language and her policy, we cannot help suspecting that she entertained a certain secret liking for her accomplished cousin, whose qualities she both admired and feared. With all her weaknesses, too, she possessed a singular knowledge of character. Although she often betrayed a friend, she never trusted an enemy; and a personal acquaintance with Mary might have satisfied her that she was not the fascinating fiend painted by the suspicious fancy of Cecil and Bacon. To Mary's very reasonable request, however, no answer was returned; and as week after week passed away without a word of explanation, the conviction gradually

[1] Labanoff, iii. 106. Her letter is written on the same day on which she signed the agreement with Cecil—*i.e.*, the 16th October.

grew upon her that she had been once more deceived. Her suspicions were strengthened by intelligence which she received from Scotland. One of her stanchest friends, the Laird of Lochinvar,[1] informed her that he had seen several letters written by the Earl of Morton to his friends, in which he assured them that the Queen of England would do nothing to their disadvantage, for she herself had privately given him to understand that the Chatsworth treaty was a farce which was merely intended to amuse the Queen of Scots and her Catholic allies.[2] In confirmation of Lochinvar's letter, Mary was further informed that although a truce had been concluded between the rival factions during the negotiations, Lennox continued his persecutions of her adherents by seizing their castles and laying waste their lands. She also learned, to her unspeakable sorrow, that her son, now in his fifth year, was at this time being taught by his preceptors to speak of her in the most odious and offensive terms. Of all the strokes of fortune that had yet befallen her, this was the hardest to be borne; and she called upon Elizabeth to use her influence with Lennox, who, she truly added, "dared not disobey her," to put a stop to conduct so outrageous.[3] Mary was about this time prostrated by a dangerous attack of illness, which was certainly aggravated, if not caused, by her mental sufferings; and it was the opinion of Fénelon that she felt

[1] After the battle of Langside, the Regent Murray made a progress through Galloway, during which he sent various friendly messages to Lochinvar. But he refused in any way to acknowledge the Government of the regent; and in consequence of his refusal his castle of Kenmore was destroyed.—See Bannatyne's Miscellany, i. 24.

[2] Letter of 21st November; Labanoff, iii. 122.

[3] Letter to the Bishop of Ross of 24th November; Labanoff, iii. 127.

more acutely this cruel blow to her affections than all her other troubles.[1] Change of air having been recommended, Mary was now transported to Sheffield Castle, a seat of the Earl of Shrewsbury, at which she was destined to spend no less than fourteen years of her prison-life in England. On hearing of her illness, and its too probable cause, Elizabeth, in a fit of compassion or remorse, despatched two physicians to attend her, and she also allowed the Bishop of Ross to accompany them. She even condescended to write a letter of condolence to her prisoner, and also to send her a ring in token of her affection. Mary received with gratitude these unlooked-for proofs of sympathy; but she remained for some weeks in a precarious state, until the strength of her constitution finally prevailed over the malady under which she laboured. During her convalescence she appealed to Elizabeth, whose unexpected attentions during her illness had revived her hopes, to proceed to the execution of the treaty. She addressed letters with the same intent to Cecil, to Sussex, and even to Leicester. But the only answer she received was, that the commissioners of the regent had not yet arrived from Scotland. Despairing at length as the winter wore away, while she looked in vain for tidings of the treaty, and remembering the

[1] He says that her principal sorrow was "un crèvecuer trop grand, qu'elle a d'aulcunes mauvaises parolles qu'on a aprins au prince d'Escoce, son filz, de profèrer d'elle."—Fénelon au roy, 18th Dec. 1570, iii. 402. In a letter to Fénelon written after her recovery, Mary complains that Buchanan, who had been employed to slander her by Murray and his faction, had been appointed tutor to her son. She begs the French ambassador to represent the matter to Elizabeth, and adds, "Le dicts Buccanan est agé et desormais a besoin de demeurer en un lieu de repos plustost que se tourmanter auprès d'un enfant."—4th March 1571; Labanoff, iii. 202.

warning she had received from Lochinvar, she directed the Bishop of Ross, who had by this time returned to London, to inform Elizabeth that she was resolved to avail herself of the aid of foreign princes to recover her throne, in case the agreement concluded at Chatsworth remained any longer unfulfilled. This letter was dated the 6th of February 1571;[1] and it was probably written in consequence of a communication which she had just received, and which was attended with important consequences both to herself and to her friends.

It has already been mentioned that a Florentine settled in London, named Ridolphi, had been implicated in the rising of the northern lords in 1569.[2] He had been suspected at the time; but the explanations which he furnished of his conduct were deemed satisfactory, and he continued to carry on his business of a banker as formerly. This man, who was of a restless intriguing character, and who maintained a close correspondence with the Papal Court, now addressed a letter to the Queen of Scots, in which he advised her no longer to trust to the promises of Elizabeth, which she never intended to fulfil, but to appeal for aid to the Catholic Powers.[3] As Mary was probably by this time convinced that it was hopeless to look for the execution of the Chatsworth treaty, and irritated, no doubt, by the deception practised upon her, as well as by the conduct of her enemies in Scotland, she desired the Bishop of Ross to consult with the Duke of Norfolk respecting the project of Ridolphi;[4] and that she was abundantly justified under the

[1] Labanoff, iii. 175.
[2] *Ante*, vol. i. 497.
[3] See Appendix B.
[4] Labanoff, iii. 181.

circumstances in seeking the aid of the Catholic Powers, is not to be disputed. Before any active steps, however, were taken in the matter, the long-looked-for commissioners from Scotland arrived in London. They consisted of the Earl of Morton, the Abbot of Dunfermline, and James Macgill, all of them notorious enemies of the Scottish queen. So far, indeed, from repressing their sentiments towards the sovereign they had deposed, they took the first opportunity of declaring them in the most emphatic manner. Cecil, who had now been created Lord Burghley,[1] along with the Lord Keeper, Sir Walter Mildmay, and Sir Francis Knollys, were appointed to confer with them; and the secretary informed them that his mistress "now expected to receive from them such evident reasons for their proceedings against their queen as wherewith she might both satisfy herself, and with honour answer to the world for that which she did."[2] Thus challenged, Morton undertook to justify the deposition of the queen from the doctrines of the civil and canon law, from examples taken from Scottish history, and from the opinions of Calvin. By desire of the English ministers, the reasons thus stated were put in writing and submitted to Elizabeth. But as they propounded some doctrines extremely distasteful to her, more especially that on which the Scottish commissioners insisted that the people had an inherent right to depose their sovereigns, she replied "that she was in no sort satisfied with their reasons." She desired them, therefore, "to go into the second head, and devise what they thought meetest for the safety of their king and themselves."[3]

[1] In February 1571. [2] Spottiswoode, 148. [3] Ibid.

After a delay of two days, Morton again appeared before the Council, and declared that the reasons for the deposition of Mary had already been laid before Elizabeth. As to the second point, he reminded them that the prince had already been crowned King of Scotland, and had been duly recognised by all good subjects. He entreated the Queen of England, therefore, not to withdraw the support which she had hitherto afforded them, as in that case he feared they would be unable to maintain the authority which was necessary for the peace of the realm.[1]

Although the reply of Morton was to all appearance couched in terms sufficiently courteous, Elizabeth thought fit to regard it as a threat that if she withdrew her protection from the regent he would seek the aid of France. But she laid the blame, not on Morton, but on some of her ministers, who, she declared, had instigated him to use this audacious language, and who for their pains deserved to be hanged at the door of the council chamber with their pestilent advice tied round their throats.[2] She added that she would not suffer Morton to leave London until the matter was brought, one way or other, to a final issue.

The Bishop of Ross, the Bishop of Galloway,[3] and Lord Livingstone, had been appointed by Mary to represent her in London, and the firm attitude now so unexpectedly assumed by Elizabeth induced them, as well as the French ambassador, to hope — even at the eleventh hour — for a favourable decision.

[1] Fénelon, letter of 12th March 1571. [2] Ibid.
[3] A kinsman of Huntly named Alexander Gordon.

Burghley and his adherents in the Council were in a state of utter uncertainty as to how the matter would end; and, in their alarm at the prospects of Mary's restoration, they had recourse to an expedient which, to avert so great a calamity, they no doubt considered highly laudable.

Francis Walsingham, of whose employment in the public service we now hear for the first time, had been sent on a special mission to Paris, and he now addressed a letter to Elizabeth, most probably in concert with his colleagues, in which he informed her that he had discovered a secret project for the marriage of Mary Stewart to the Duke of Anjou, that the Pope had promised his sanction to the union, and that it was arranged to take place as soon as the Queen of Scots was restored to her throne in terms of the Chatsworth treaty.[1] There can be no doubt that the story thus so circumstantially told by Walsingham was a pure fiction, invented for a very obvious purpose. We have not only no evidence that any such match was contemplated, but we have the best proof to the contrary in the admitted fact that Catherine, who held undisputed sway at the French Court, was straining every nerve at this time to bring about a marriage between her favourite son and the Queen of England.[2] Fénelon, the active friend of Mary, must have certainly been acquainted with the scheme, if any such existed. But he describes it simply as a

[1] Fénelon, iv. 20.

[2] Walsingham himself had written to Leicester a short time before "that there was nothing more desired than two marriages; the one between my mistress and Monsieur, the other between the Prince of Navarre and the king's sister."—17th Feb., Digges.

diplomatic trick of Elizabeth's ministers,[1] which was intended to stir up afresh her unquenchable jealousy of her rival, and arrest the progress of the treaty. The French ambassador adds that Walsingham's letter threw her into such a state of fury that he not only regarded the negotiations as at an end, but that he believed even the life of Mary to be in danger.[2]

We may assume that it was not without extreme anxiety that Walsingham and his colleagues had recourse to this hazardous device. They all strongly approved of the marriage of their mistress with the Duke of Anjou, and by working on her jealousy they might defeat the project altogether. Yet it was better to run this, or any other risk, than allow the restoration of the Scottish queen. To deceive their mistress might be dangerous, but to set up her rival they regarded as destruction.

It is probable, however, that Elizabeth soon began to suspect the truth regarding Walsingham's story, for

[1] "Artifice des adversaires."—Fénelon, iv. 25.

[2] Mr Froude makes some remarks on the subject of the Anjou marriage which appear to be wholly inexplicable. He represents the Queen of Scots as having been desirous at this time of securing her brother-in-law the Duke of Anjou as a husband for herself. "Suddenly," he says, "with overwhelming surprise, she learnt that her false lover was going over to the English queen, that a marriage between them was seriously contemplated, and that the fault would not be with Charles or Catherine if Anjou did not soon become the husband of Elizabeth," &c. He adds that, "stung to fury by this unlooked-for blow, she watched with impatience the lingering of the treaty which now she could scarcely wish to succeed," &c. (x. 145). Mr Froude gives no authority for this extraordinary passage, nor have I been able to find any. That Elizabeth was "stung to fury" by the story told by Walsingham, we learn very distinctly from Fénelon; and the only possible explanation of the statement of Mr Froude seems to be, that he may have mistaken the one queen for the other.

we learn from Fénelon that in the course of a few days she again began to waver, and no one could tell what would be the result.[1] It seemed as if she was profoundly convinced that this was the last opportunity she should ever have of coming to terms with her sister queen, and she hesitated long before she flung it finally away. But when, to all appearance, she had at last made up her mind to proceed to the execution of the treaty, a new and wholly unexpected obstacle arose—Morton pretended that he had no authority to consent either to the restoration of Mary or to the removal of her son to England. He was prepared to take his oath to this effect; but he added that if the Queen of England desired it, he was ready to proceed to Scotland for the purpose of summoning a Parliament, which could alone confer on him the necessary powers. We cannot doubt that Morton started this final objection to the treaty with the concurrence—if not at the instigation—of Burghley and his colleagues. This fresh piece of duplicity took Mary's commissioners completely by surprise, and the Bishop of Ross did not hesitate to denounce it on the spot as a miserable subterfuge. He added that his mistress had been grossly deceived; but that, notwithstanding the devices of her enemies, the Queen of England was bound in honour to fulfil the engage-

[1] Ibid., p. 26. Leicester was of the same opinion. On the 26th February he writes to Walsingham: "On the one side, she is loath to set her (Mary) up; on the other, she is as loath to defend that which she is not well persuaded to have justice with it." He adds, "It appears that both ways be dangerous touching the Queen of Scots, for there is danger for delivering of her to her Government, so is there danger in retaining her in prison. In the mean time," he concludes, "whatsoever you may hear, believe me, there is no man can tell you which way it will go."—Digges, 51.

ments she had solemnly contracted.[1] But it was to the friends of Morton that these warm remonstrances were addressed; and in pronouncing their final decision on the question, they simply observed that as the representatives of Mary and those of the regent could not come to terms, they considered their commission at an end.[2]

Thus ended the Chatsworth negotiations, and with them all hopes of peace between the Queen of England and her rival. Not choice, but necessity, henceforth compelled each to regard the other as her enemy. From this time forth it became a fixed maxim of policy with the dominant faction in England that Mary Stewart should never be restored to liberty. It became a fixed article of faith, on the other hand, with the partisans of the captive queen, that they were justified in resorting to force, not only to effect her freedom, but to place her on her rival's throne; and, setting religious prejudice aside, it cannot be denied that the latter occupied much higher moral ground than their opponents. The continued detention of Mary was an outrage so indefensible that no serious attempt has been made, at least in modern times, to justify it. But political crimes, by whatever names they may be called, of necessity provoke retaliation; and when Mary's friends plotted the overthrow of Elizabeth, although they were legally guilty of treason, can it be maintained in truth and justice that they were more culpable than Lord Burghley and his colleagues, the first aggressors in the deadly strife, whose selfish ambition rendered the conflict inevitable, and who, in the eyes

[1] See Leslie's Negotiations in Anderson, iii.

[2] Tytler, vii. 283.

of impartial posterity, must be held responsible for its results?

Shortly after his elevation to the regency, the Earl of Lennox, naturally desirous of bringing to justice the most prominent of the murderers of his son, despatched an envoy named Thomas Buchanan to Denmark to negotiate with the king for the surrender of Bothwell. While Morton was in London, a letter reached him addressed to Lennox by his envoy in Copenhagen. Before it was forwarded to its destination, it was opened and read by Morton—a circumstance abundantly significant of the influence he exercised over the regent. The despatch has disappeared; but that it contained some matter which he did not venture to submit even to the friendly eye of Elizabeth, we learn from Morton himself. On hearing that he had received a letter from Denmark, her curiosity was roused, and she desired to see it. Morton pretended to comply with her wishes, and sent her a copy, but with certain passages omitted, which, as he expressed it, "would rather have hindered than furthered our cause."[1] Why he should have sent a mutilated copy of this letter to Elizabeth, it is impossible, in the absence of the original, to explain. But it has been naturally conjectured that the passages which he so carefully suppressed in the pretended copy, either criminated himself, or exonerated the queen. Whatever may have been his motives, we learn from this incident that Morton did not hesitate to falsify a document even when he desired to deceive his friends. We may safely conclude that he was not more scrupulous as regards his enemies.

[1] See his letter to Lennox; Goodall, ii. 382.

It is further to be observed that Morton on this occasion brought with him a second time to London the famous silver casket and its contents.[1] But it was not produced, nor was it even referred to, in the course of the various discussions which took place. Morton discoursed boldly as to the duties and the rights of princes and their subjects; but he never ventured to say to the ministers of Elizabeth, "the mother of my sovereign is a murderess; here are the proofs of her guilt, which you yourselves have seen; these are the grounds upon which she has been deposed, and upon these I protest, in the name of the regent and the States of Scotland, that she shall not be restored." If Morton had known the contents of the casket to be genuine, he could hardly have failed to use this language; for it would have furnished a conclusive answer to the representations both of Elizabeth and of Mary's commissioners. But although he brought to England a second time the alleged proofs of his sovereign's guilt, he did not venture to allude even to their existence. Elizabeth was equally and ominously silent. The negotiations for the restoration of her rival proceeded as if the conferences at York and Westminster had been utterly forgotten; and the casket and its contents found their way once more back to Scotland, where they finally disappeared in the same mysterious manner in which they first saw the light of day.

[1] Goodall, ii. 91.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CONSPIRACY OF RIDOLPHI.

THE absolute impunity with which Elizabeth had hitherto violated her obligations to her neighbours forms one of the most striking features in her history. We have seen that Scotland had been incessantly distracted by her intrigues for upwards of ten years, and that the anarchy which now prevailed in that country was mainly the work of her insidious policy. In France she had secretly instigated the Protestants to take up arms, and had even at times openly supported them in their rebellion. Yet the political condition of France and Scotland was such that both countries were compelled to avoid a rupture with England. It seemed doubtful whether a similar policy could be practised with the like impunity against the most formidable of the European Powers; but, emboldened by their past experience, the Queen of England and her ministers did not hesitate to make the attempt.

Towards the close of the year 1568, certain Spanish vessels, to avoid capture by Huguenot privateers, took refuge in Southampton harbour. They had on board a large quantity of bullion consigned to the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands; and the Spanish

ambassador in London represented the matter to the queen, and applied for permission to have the treasure transported by land to Dover, whence it might be forwarded to its destination. But the temptation of appropriating half a million of Spanish ducats proved irresistible; and the representative of Philip was informed that the queen was not satisfied as to whom the money really belonged, and that for the present it must remain in her hands.[1]

The Duke of Alva was at this time in urgent need of money, and, irritated beyond measure at the conduct of Elizabeth, he issued an order for the seizure of all English ships and property in Antwerp. By this rash proceeding the original ground of quarrel was speedily lost sight of. The English Government retaliated upon Alva by seizing all Spanish ships in English harbours. A lengthened correspondence followed, which ended in the restoration of the vessels upon both sides. But all attempts to recover the intercepted treasure from Elizabeth proved unavailing. Under a series of ever-varying pretexts,[2] she insisted in detaining it, as she detained the Queen of Scots, in open violation of the rules of international usage, practised even in that lawless age.

This incident, comparatively unimportant in itself, was attended, nevertheless, by most important consequences. Being deprived thus unexpectedly of the means of paying his troops, the Duke of Alva, to raise the money necessary for the purpose, devised a new and most ruinous scheme of taxation for the Nether-

[1] Lingard, vi. 114.

[2] See on the subject Fénelon, i. 48, 59, 76, 89, 90, 726; Camden, 175; Cabala, 158, 160; Murdin, 766.

lands. Although, to escape the terrors of the Inquisition, numbers of the inhabitants had fled to Germany and to England, the people had in general borne, with a remarkable degree of patience, his religious persecutions. But he quickly learned that religious persecution, even of the most aggravated kind, was far less dangerous than the imposition of an odious tax. Alva had at this time driven the insurgent armies from the field, and his "Council of Blood" might have succeeded in rooting out Protestantism in the Low Countries, as it had already been rooted out in Spain and Italy. Yet he failed, in the very zenith of his power, to compel the men of the Netherlands to pay "the tenth-penny;"[1] and his dogged adherence to this insane project led to a fierce renewal of the struggle, and eventually to their independence.

But although the conduct of Elizabeth furnished ample cause of war, the King of Spain, as she well knew, had strong reasons at this time for avoiding hostilities with England. His armies were fully employed in the Netherlands, and in Grenada where an insurrection of the Moors had broken out afresh; while his fleets were preparing, with those of Venice, for his long-meditated crusade against the Sultan. Smothering his resentment, therefore, for the present, he simply protested against the extraordinary conduct of his sister-in-law, and awaited, with characteristic patience, for an opportunity of revenge. The Duke of Alva was equally averse to an open breach with England; but, in anticipation of coming events, he was prepared

[1] As to the nature of this extraordinary tax, see Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic, ii. 277.

to aid the Queen of Scots to the utmost of his power; and although his treasury was nearly empty, he had furnished ten thousand crowns for the support of her garrisons in Edinburgh and Dumbarton. The money was paid to Lord Seton, who had been despatched to the Netherlands by Mary's friends in Scotland, and it proved of essential service at the time.[1]

Such was the attitude of Spain—

"Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike"—

when Mary, despairing of the fulfilment of the Chatsworth treaty, was induced, by the Bishop of Ross and the Spanish ambassador in London, Don Gueraldo d'Espés, to accept the proffered services of Ridolphi. The next step was to gain over the Duke of Norfolk to the plot, and this was a process both difficult and dangerous. The duke had been released from custody in the previous autumn, and on obtaining his liberty he had signed a solemn declaration that "he would never deal in that cause of marriage of the Queen of Scots, nor in any other cause belonging to her,"[2] but with the full knowledge and consent of his mistress. But, notwithstanding his professions of loyalty and obedience, he was still an object of suspicion; and his movements were so closely watched, that the conspirators could only venture to communicate with him indirectly, through a gentleman of his household named Barker, with whom the Bishop of Ross was well acquainted. Through this channel the plan of the conspiracy was secretly imparted to the duke, who took care, however, according to the evidence of

[1] Spottiswoode, 131.

[2] See his declaration in Haynes, 598.

the bishop and of Barker, not to commit himself by writing, or even by speech.[1] But that he expressed no disapproval of the plot is certain. This unfortunate nobleman seems, in short, through sheer feebleness of character, to have drifted into crime. He hesitated between duty and inclination until the current of events swept him helplessly along, he knew not whither. With too little courage for a conspirator, yet with too much ambition for a subject, he could not resist the temptation of a crown; but he had lost his only chance of winning it by his vacillating conduct in the northern rebellion, which had deceived his friends, but had not deceived Elizabeth. Fortune had endowed the duke with many gifts: the foremost rank in the English peerage, a princely fortune, a goodly presence, and native powers of eloquence which, on his trial, rendered him no unworthy antagonist of his accusers. But with all his advantages, nature had marked him for a dupe. He had been the tool successively of Maitland and of the Regent Murray, and he was now to be the victim of an Italian adventurer, the enemy of his country and of his religion. Nothing, indeed, weighs so heavily against the Duke of Norfolk as the fact that he was the only Englishman engaged in the conspiracy. The Bishop of Ross was no subject of Elizabeth, and he might justify all he did on the plea of duty to his mistress. The Spanish ambassador might allege that he was responsible for his acts to his own Government alone; and even Ridolphi might plead zeal for his faith as a justification of his conduct. But, as an Englishman,

[1] See their depositions in Murdin.

Norfolk knew that to conspire against his queen was the act of a traitor, and, as a Protestant, that to seek the overthrow of his religion was the work of an apostate. Nor can it lastly be alleged, in extenuation of his conduct, that love, or even manly sympathy for the wrongs of the unhappy princess, whose liberation was the first object of the enterprise, induced him to quit the path of duty. He never saw the Scottish queen; and although his vanity might be flattered by the prospect of marrying the finest woman of the age, he never seems to have regarded her in any other light than as a stepping-stone to power.

After various verbal communications had passed between the conspirators and the duke, he at length consented to a secret interview with Ridolphi, at which the Florentine explained in detail his proposed plan of operations.[1] A body of Spanish troops was to be landed in England under the Duke of Alva's son, Don Frederick of Toledo. With the aid of Norfolk and his friends, the Queen of Scots would then be set at liberty. As regarded Elizabeth, not only was there no design against her life, but she was even to be allowed to retain her crown, on condition of her adopting the Catholic faith and consenting to the marriage of Norfolk and Mary Stewart. Finally, Ridolphi indicated to the duke the names of the leading Catholic nobles who were willing to take part in the enterprise. These were the Earl of Arundel, the Lords Montague and Lumley, Sir John Arundel, and Sir Thomas Stanley.

If the duke had been either a wise or an honest man, he must at once, and for ever, have declined all

[1] See in Murdin the confessions of Barker and of the Bishop of Ross.

participation in this wild scheme. But he seems to have thought that he could play at treason with impunity; and that, as circumstances might guide him, he could either engage more deeply in the game or retire. Although he refused to commit himself by any direct correspondence with the Catholic Powers,[1] or even with Ridolphi, the latter left him in the full belief that, provided the promised aid arrived in England, the duke would place himself at the head of the rebellion.

A letter of instructions was accordingly drawn up for Ridolphi, in all probability by himself, with the assistance of the Bishop of Ross and the Spanish ambassador. It was addressed, in the name of the duke, to the Pope and the King of Spain, requesting their assistance in his treasonable design of dethroning his sovereign and restoring the ancient religion.

After describing the oppressions and cruelties practised upon the Catholics, "who[2] were more numerous and powerful" than their enemies, the duke is made to say that he and his friends were decidedly opposed to the marriage of Elizabeth with a French prince, which might eventually lead to a union of the crowns of England and France; and that they desired instead a marriage between the Queen of Scots and Norfolk himself, so that the whole of Britain might be united, and the ancient faith restored; that although he still professed himself a Protestant, because he desired to retain the services of his Protestant friends,

[1] It appears, however, that Norfolk did eventually write to Philip, engaging to place himself at the head of the Catholic nobility of England and Scotland, with the purpose of restoring the ancient religion.—Memorias de la Real academia de la historia, 357.

[2] "Il maggior numero e più potente."—Labanoff, iii. 238.

he pledged himself, in the event of his project succeeding, through the assistance of the Pope and the King of Spain, to be hereafter guided on the subject of religion by their advice; that to insure the success of the enterprise he required an auxiliary force of eight thousand infantry, with twenty-five thousand field-pieces, and a sufficient supply of military stores; that if these troops could be spared from the Netherlands and landed at *Harwich in Norfolk*, or *Portsmouth in Sussex*, he engaged to join them immediately with an army of twenty thousand foot and three thousand horse; and that if, in addition to the above-named auxiliaries, two thousand troops could be sent to Scotland and two thousand to Ireland, so as to oblige the Queen of England to divide her forces, there could be no doubt as to the result.

This letter, written wholly in Italian, was not signed by the Duke of Norfolk; and it is probable that he never saw it. Its bold and confident tone is wholly inconsistent with his cautious and vacillating disposition; nor can we suppose that he could have made the geographical blunders of placing Harwich in Norfolk and Portsmouth in Sussex. But these are mistakes into which a stranger in England might easily have fallen, and which we may venture to ascribe to the Bishop of Ross, to Ridolphi, or to the Spanish ambassador—all of whom had probably a hand in its composition.

At the same time, a letter of instructions was obtained from the Queen of Scots. It was probably drawn up by the Bishop of Ross, and it referred generally to the persecution of the English Catholics; to the dangers to which the Queen of Scots was exposed;

to the hopelessness of her recovering her liberty, except by means of foreign aid; and to the project of the Duke of Norfolk, which his own letter would more fully explain. The concluding passage of Mary's instructions was the most important. It ran as follows: "You will declare to his Holiness that, to our great grief, we were made a prisoner by one of our subjects, the Earl of Bothwell, and by him forcibly carried off, along with the Earl of Huntly and our secretary, to the Castle of Dunbar, and afterwards to the Castle of Edinburgh, where we were detained against our will by the said Earl of Bothwell, until he had procured a pretended divorce[1] from his wife, the sister of the Earl of Huntly, our near kinsman, and obliged us to consent, against our will, to *a pretended marriage with*[2] him. Entreat his Holiness to take such steps in this matter that we may be relieved from so great an indignity, either by the ordinary process in Rome, or by a commission granted to the bishops in Scotland and other Catholic judges, as to his Holiness shall seem best, after he shall have been made acquainted with all the circumstances of the case from a memorial which will be transmitted to him by the Bishop of Ross."

It would appear from these instructions that Mary was now aware that Bothwell's "pretended divorce" was wholly illegal, and that, consequently, her marriage with him was null and void. Bothwell, as we now know, had obtained a Papal dispensation for his marriage with Huntly's sister.[3] They were, therefore,

[1] "Uno pretenso divortio."—Labanoff, iii. 232.

[2] The words in italics are not in the original, but they seem to be implied by the writer.

[3] See preface to this volume.

lawfully married, and could not be divorced on the alleged ground of consanguinity. Was Mary then aware, when she consented to marry Bothwell, that he was at the time the lawful husband of another woman? It seems incredible that a strict Catholic, as Mary always was, should have committed an act of such superlative folly. Nor can we come to any other conclusion than that the existence of the Papal dispensation had been carefully concealed from the queen both by Bothwell and by his wife.

Furnished with his credentials, Ridolphi, towards the end of March, proceeded to the Netherlands, where Alva received him courteously but coldly. Although a very indifferent economist, the duke was an excellent soldier. No commander of the age displayed in all his enterprises a happier mixture of daring and discretion; and the notion of invading England with a few thousand troops seemed to his experienced eye a very hopeless project. Alva, too, was a shrewd judge of men, and he at once took the measure of Ridolphi, whom he described to Philip as "a babbling coxcomb."[1] Of the chief of the conspiracy, moreover, he entertained but a mean opinion; for he believed that Norfolk possessed neither the abilities nor the courage for the part designed for him. He never, therefore, approved of the Norfolk marriage, but would have much preferred, as a husband for the Queen of Scots, Don John of Austria, the gallant and aspiring half-brother of Philip. Sanguine by temperament, and

[1] "Un gran parlanchin."—Memorias, 359. In writing to the king a few months later, Alva says, "Ridolphi es un hombre muy vacio."—Alva to Philip, 5th September 1571; Correspondence de Philippe II., 198.

confident of success, Ridolphi spared no efforts to enlist the sympathies of Alva on his side; but the duke finally evaded his importunities by referring him to the king, without whose sanction nothing could be done.

At Rome the reception of Ridolphi was more cordial. Pius V., whose indiscreet zeal had led him to excommunicate Elizabeth, and had thus exposed the English Catholics to fresh persecutions, expressed his warm approval of the plot. He placed a sum of money at the immediate disposal of Ridolphi, gave him emphatic assurances of further support, and furnished him with a letter to the King of Spain, strongly recommending the project, and invoking his powerful aid on its behalf.[1]

From Rome Ridolphi hastened to Madrid, where, owing apparently to the representations of Alva, he was at first by no means favourably received. Ever reserved and ever suspicious, Philip even entertained grave doubts as to the true character of the Florentine. The "practices" of Lord Burghley, to use his own favourite term, were well known at Madrid; and it was even conjectured that Ridolphi might be a spy.[2] But the warm recommendations of the Pope, aided by his own assiduity and address, enabled him to overcome the prejudices of the Spanish king; and a council was summoned to deliberate on the project of invading England, and of placing Mary Stewart on the throne of Elizabeth. We have seen that in his communications with Mary and with Norfolk, Ridolphi had expressed no hostility against the person of the

[1] Lingard, vi. 128.

[2] Apuntamientos, 112, 113. Philip to Espés; Memorias, 360.

English queen. On the contrary, every precaution was to be taken for her security. But to Philip and his ministers he held very different language. To them he represented the murder of Elizabeth as a condition indispensable to the success of the plot.[1] He explained that the assassination might easily be effected in the course of the autumn, when she usually resided in the country; and he indicated the Marquis Vitelli,[2] an officer who had greatly distinguished himself in the wars of the Netherlands, as the person most suitable for the purpose. Ridolphi assured the council that, immediately on the death of Elizabeth, the Duke of Norfolk and all the principal nobility would forthwith take up arms, and, with the aid of Alva's auxiliaries, place Mary on the vacant throne.

Ridolphi had failed to convince the Duke of Alva of the prudence, or even of the practicability, of his scheme; and the Spanish commander had communicated his opinion to his master in very decided terms. But Philip, although by no means of an enterprising nature, was strongly disposed at this time to lend a willing ear to any scheme of hostility against the Queen of England. The intense bigotry of the Spanish king was well known, moreover, to Ridolphi; and the artful Florentine did not hesitate to flatter him with the splendid prospect of restoring Britain to the bosom of the Church—an enterprise of which he might reap all the glory as well as all the profit. To extirpate heresy in the West, and to stem the tide of Mohammedan

[1] Memorias, vii. 358, 362, 441, 457.

[2] Beyond Ridolphi's statement, there is no evidence that this officer was in any way implicated in the plot. Vitelli had visited England, and had been treated with great courtesy by Elizabeth.—See Lingard, vi. 129, note.

conquest in the East, was the double duty which Philip at this time sincerely believed to be imposed upon him by the will of Heaven; and in spite of the warning of Alva, and the adverse opinion of several of his council, he finally gave his full assent to the murderous project of Ridolphi.[1]

But in most of the important transactions of his reign, Philip made up his mind too late. Before he finally resolved to adopt Ridolphi's scheme, events had taken place in England which completely changed the aspect of affairs, and rendered its execution impossible.

Before leaving Brussels, Ridolphi had intrusted to one Charles Bailly a packet to be delivered to the Bishop of Ross in London. It consisted of books and letters, the former being copies of the bishop's Defence of Mary, which had been printed at Liege, and the latter being addressed to various persons of rank in England. Bailly, who was a retainer of the Queen of Scots, was arrested on suspicion on his arrival at Dover; but through the intervention of Lord Cobham, the Lord Warden, who was a secret partisan of the Scottish queen, the bishop contrived to obtain possession of the more important letters, and in particular of one in cipher addressed by Ridolphi to Norfolk, which contained a detailed account of his negotiations with the Duke of Alva. In the place of these damning documents the bishop dexterously sealed up in Bailly's packet a quantity of papers which could implicate no one; and when the unfortunate man was thrown into prison, and cruelly tortured, he was unable to disclose anything[2] of material importance. In the course of

[1] Lingard, vi. 129.

[2] See his examination in Murdin.

his examination, he admitted that at Mechlin he had conversed with the Earl of Westmoreland, with the Countess of Northumberland, and with Leonard Dacre; and he further admitted that at Brussels he had written letters to the dictation of Ridolphi, which, under the numbers 30 and 40, he believed to be intended for the Spanish ambassador and the Queen of Scots. These numbers, it was afterwards ascertained, in reality indicated the Duke of Norfolk and the Lord Lumley. But for the present all the efforts of Lord Burghley and his colleagues to probe the matter to the bottom were defeated by the bishop. Although, in defiance of international customs, his house was ransacked, and he himself subjected to a searching examination, nothing was discovered; nor was anything admitted by him which could criminate his mistress. He readily acknowledged that when Ridolphi set out for the Netherlands he had requested him to seek the aid of the Duke of Alva on behalf of his loyal countrymen in Scotland, but with any conspiracy against the Queen of England he solemnly disclaimed all connection.[1]

With these explanations Burghley was by no means satisfied. He knew the intriguing character of the bishop; he suspected the Spanish ambassador; he was convinced that there were other parties in league with them for some unlawful purpose, the nature of which he had as yet failed to discover. A singular incident at length revealed the truth.

Piracy in the early middle ages had been the favourite occupation of the northern European nations; and in the general thirst for maritime enterprise

[1] See in Murdin the examinations of Bailly and of the Bishop of Ross.

which distinguished the sixteenth century, the English resumed on a more extended scale the predatory habits of their Scandinavian ancestors. Numberless adventurers, who acknowledged no law but that of might, infested every sea; and although their sovereign was nominally at peace with Philip, the rich commerce and the vast colonial possessions of Spain were mercilessly plundered with the connivance of the Queen of England, who was well content to share with her enterprising subjects the profits of their piratical adventures.[1] But these were not invariably successful. In one of his marauding expeditions to the coast of Mexico, Sir John Hawkins, the most renowned of the English buccaneers, met with a disaster in which a number of his men were captured by the Spaniards. It was not the custom of the age to treat prisoners of war with much humanity, even when they were able to pay a ransom for their liberty; and the English sailors were shipped off to Seville, and there thrust into filthy dungeons, with the miserable prospect before them of being hanged as pirates, burnt as heretics, or slowly starved to death, as their captors might determine. Hawkins naturally sympathised with comrades who long had shared his triumphs and his dangers thus lingering in hopeless captivity; but how to relieve them was a task beyond his strength. His sovereign was nominally at peace with Spain; but he lived in an age when morals were held of small account by the wisest and the greatest, and the rough sailor of fortune saw no harm in seeking to accomplish by fraud what he could not venture to obtain by force. He hit upon a scheme which he privately disclosed to Lord Burgh-

[1] See Froude, xi. 402, 403.

ley, and with his sanction he sought an interview with the Spanish ambassador. Admitted to the presence of Don Gueraldo, Hawkins informed him that he, as well as numbers of his comrades, were disgusted with the treatment they had received at the hands of the Government, and that he was in secret a warm supporter of the Queen of Scots, and was ready on the first opportunity to take up arms on her behalf. He only required some assistance from the King of Spain, and, in the first instance, that his imprisoned comrades at Seville should be restored to liberty. On these conditions he was ready to enter the service of Philip, and to bring over with him the finest ships and the best sailors in the English navy.

Don Gueraldo, who entertained very exaggerated notions of the amount of discontent prevailing in England, and who firmly believed that the days of Elizabeth's rule were numbered, was overjoyed at this fresh proof of disaffection among the subjects of the heretic queen, and he hastened to inform the Duke of Alva of the tempting offer made by Hawkins. But Alva was obstinately incredulous regarding the success of all projected revolutions in England. He evidently had formed a much truer estimate of the position of Elizabeth than his countrymen in general, and he received the communication of Don Gueraldo with the same reserve as he did the proposals of Ridolphi. But the encouragement which Hawkins had received from the Spanish ambassador induced him, with the concurrence of Burghley, to follow up his scheme. He despatched one of his officers named Fitzwilliam, who seems to have been in every way well fitted for the delicate part he had to play, to repeat to Philip in

person the offer which had been made to his representative in London. In consequence of the recommendation of Don Gueraldo, Fitzwilliam was well received in Madrid; but being without credentials of any kind, he was naturally asked whether he or Sir John Hawkins was personally known to the Queen of Scots, or to any of the leading Catholic nobility. The envoy was obliged to reply in the negative; but he adroitly avoided all further questioning by boldly declaring that he had come to Spain solely as the representative of Sir John Hawkins, who was well able to fulfil his promises, provided the prisoners at Seville were released, and a sum of money was advanced for the equipment of the fleet. On these conditions he was ready to quit the English service for that of the Spanish king.

The singularly advantageous offer thus made to Philip might well have awakened his suspicions. In exchange for a handful of friendless prisoners he was to receive into his service the best ships, the best sailors, and the best commander in the English navy. But it was certain that Don Gueraldo, who had seen and conversed with Hawkins, believed him to be acting in good faith; and Fitzwilliam was finally informed that if he brought a letter of recommendation from the Queen of Scots, his proposals would be favourably considered by the Spanish council. Before quitting Madrid, Fitzwilliam had so far won the confidence of the Duke of Feria, an important member of the council, and of the duchess, who was an Englishwoman,[1] that they intrusted him with letters for the Scottish

[1] Jane Dormer, a daughter of Sir William Dormer. She had been a maid of honour to Mary Tudor.

queen. With these, and with the cautious reply of Philip, he returned to England.

It was obvious that unless the required letter of credence could be obtained from Mary, the daring scheme of Hawkins must be abandoned, and the gross deception practised on Don Gueraldo and his master in all probability exposed. But this was a result which Hawkins and Burghley were alike desirous to avoid. The one was anxious to recover his comrades, and to obtain, besides, a round sum of money; and the other hoped to ascertain by means of Fitzwilliam the real intentions of the King of Spain. It was resolved, therefore, that in his assumed character of a partisan of the Scottish queen, Fitzwilliam should repair to Sheffield Castle. From the time of Bailly's arrest, she had been watched and guarded with the utmost care; and Burghley did not think it prudent to acquaint even her keeper, Shrewsbury, with the real object of Fitzwilliam's visit. Cecil was obviously of opinion that secrets of so perilous a kind were to be imparted only to those whom it was absolutely necessary to trust. He accordingly wrote to Shrewsbury, stating that Fitzwilliam had some friends who were confined in a Spanish prison, and that a letter from the Queen of Scots to Philip might induce him to set them free. Fitzwilliam proceeded, accordingly, to Sheffield, and was admitted to an audience of the captive queen. The letters which he brought from the Duke and Duchess of Feria disarmed all suspicion of treachery; and when he entreated her to intercede with Philip on behalf of his imprisoned countrymen, she, after some slight hesitation, cheerfully promised to comply with his request. She ought to compas-

sionate prisoners, she said, for she was a prisoner herself, and she would gladly do all she could to relieve an Englishman.[1]

Mary had often, in the course of her eventful life, been the dupe of her good nature, but never more so than on this occasion. She wrote to Philip, as she had promised, on behalf of the imprisoned sailors, little dreaming that the spy and impostor to whom she gave the letter was in league with her worst enemies. She also gave him a letter and some presents for the Duchess of Feria, all of which were in due time delivered by Fitzwilliam to Hawkins, and by Hawkins to Lord Burghley. But, to the great disappointment of the secretary, there was nothing to be found in Mary's letters to criminate either her or any one else. The main object, however, of Fitzwilliam's visit to Sheffield was accomplished. He had obtained a letter from the Scottish queen, with which, and with the presents for the Duchess of Feria, he set out once more for Madrid.

All Philip's doubts were dispelled by the letters of Mary. He forthwith caused the English prisoners to be released; and believing that they would be speedily employed in his service, generously ordered each of them to receive a sum of money sufficient to defray his expenses to England. It now became absolutely necessary that Philip should disclose his plans; and Fitzwilliam ascertained the important fact that the Duke of Alva was to have an army in readiness for the invasion of England in the autumn, and that it was intended that the ships to be provided by

[1] See letter of Shrewsbury to Burghley, in which this singular interview is shortly described, 3d June 1571; Record Office.

Hawkins should take part in the expedition. But Philip and his ministers were discreetly silent as to the intended murder of Elizabeth. Alva had distinctly informed his master that unless she was either dead or a prisoner, he should consider the enterprise as hopeless. But it was unnecessary to discuss this delicate topic with the emissary of Hawkins, who only undertook, on certain conditions, to furnish a naval force to be employed in Philip's service. An agreement to that effect was accordingly drawn up and signed by Fitzwilliam on the part of Hawkins, and by the Duke of Feria on the part of Philip.[1] By this instrument the latter not only engaged to pay in advance to the English buccaneer a large sum of money for his services, but to grant him a free pardon for the innumerable depredations which he and his comrades had for years past committed against the commerce and the colonies of Spain. No longer dreaming now of treachery, and gratified beyond measure at the completion of a treaty which secured for his projected enterprise the services of the first seaman of the age, Philip evinced his satisfaction by conferring on him the title of a grandee of Spain.

At the very same time, therefore, that Philip and his council were conspiring at Madrid to murder the Queen of England, Hawkins and Burghley were conspiring in London to rob the Spanish king; and the complete success of their scheme is one of the most singular incidents of the age. The real intention of Hawkins, if he had joined the Spanish fleet, was to destroy it on the first opportunity; but the course of

[1] This curious treaty was signed on the 10th August 1571.— Apuntamientos, 357 *et seq.*

events rendered the projected invasion at this time impossible. He had, however, in the mean time, by a series of most artful devices, in all of which Burghley was his accomplice, grossly imposed upon the Queen of Scots, and defrauded the King of Spain out of fifty thousand pounds—a sum equivalent, at the present day, to probably six times that amount. Burghley no doubt regarded the transaction as a masterpiece of diplomatic art. The two enemies whom he most dreaded in the world were the King of Spain and the Queen of Scots; and he had not only made dupes of both, but had actually employed the one to circumvent the other. What proportion of the spoil reached Elizabeth we do not know; but, as she was privy to the whole transaction,[1] we cannot doubt that she received a handsome share. Burghley, too, had attained his object by the discovery of the intended invasion, with which Charles Bailly's arrival in England was obviously connected. But one important link in the chain of evidence was still wanting, Who were the parties in England upon whom Alva and Philip and the Queen of Scots relied? Various noblemen were suspected; but another accident at length laid bare the whole of the Ridolphi plot.

On the meeting of Parliament in the spring of this year, a daring suggestion had been made to the Duke of Norfolk by the Bishop of Ross. It was well known that various measures hostile to the Catholics would be proposed; and, to frustrate the designs of their enemies, the bishop earnestly recommended Norfolk, with the aid of the disaffected nobles, to dissolve both

[1] See Froude, x. 266.

Houses by force. He reminded him that such enterprises had been executed successfully in Italy, and more recently still in Scotland. But if the bishop was the most sanguine, the duke was the most cautious of conspirators, and he flatly refused to resort to any such "Italian devices."[1] When the legislature met, various statutes extremely oppressive to the Catholics[2] were passed; and throughout the summer the duke took no apparent interest in public affairs. But, in breach of his solemn pledge, he continued to correspond, through his secretaries, with the Queen of Scots, as well as with the bishop and other political adherents.

During the month of August the French ambassador applied to a retainer of the duke, named Higford, to assist him in transmitting to Scotland a portion of Queen Mary's dowry, consisting of two thousand crowns. Higford undertook to send the money to Norfolk's steward at Shrewsbury, whose name was Bannister, and who was desired to forward it to its destination. Higford accordingly intrusted it to a carrier, informing him that it was a quantity of silver for the use of the Duke of Norfolk's steward. But the suspicions of the man were roused by the weight of the bag in which the coin was placed, and which, upon opening, he found to contain not silver but gold. There was also enclosed in the bag a letter in cipher, which greatly strengthened his suspicions; and he proceeded at once to the residence of Lord Burghley, in whose pay he probably was, and informed him of the matter. Higford was immediately summoned be-

[1] Murdin, 44.

[2] See Lingard, vi. 120, 121; and Stat. of the Realm, iv. 528.

fore the Council and desired to read the ciphered letter. He at first pleaded ignorance; but, on being warned of the consequences of his refusal—which, he well knew, meant imprisonment and torture—he at once complied. The letter was short, but its purport was clear. It desired the duke's steward at Shrewsbury to send on the money to one of the Lowthers in Westmoreland, by whom it was to be conveyed across the Border for the use of the garrison in Edinburgh Castle. Not an instant was lost in following up this not-unlooked-for discovery. For months Burghley had been baffled in his efforts to trace out the English branch of the conspiracy, which he well knew was ripening in anticipation of the Spanish project of invasion, but he was on the right scent at last. He had long suspected Norfolk, and it was now certain that he was a party to the plot. Bannister his steward, and Barker his secretary, were forthwith arrested and sent to the Tower. The former, as soon as he was stretched on the rack, disclosed all he knew; and Barker, who knew much more—for he had been the channel of communication between the Bishop of Ross, Ridolphi, and the duke—followed his example on the mere sight of the engine of torture. But the most material evidence was furnished by Higford. The duke had received various letters from the Queen of Scots, which, instead of destroying with his own hands, he, with singular imprudence, intrusted to this man to burn. But, instead of obeying his orders, Higford treacherously preserved them, with the apparent purpose of providing for his own safety in case of need.[1] These letters were

[1] See the examination of Higford in Murdin.

forthwith laid before the Council; and the evidence against Norfolk being now abundantly strong to justify his appprehension, Sir Henry Nevill was ordered to arrest him. His behaviour on being made a prisoner, like the whole of his conduct throughout, was lamentably weak. At first, being in ignorance of the confessions of his servants, he boldly denied all knowledge of the plot. On their depositions being laid before him, he exclaimed that he was betrayed; but his incoherent attempts at explanation only confirmed the testimony of his accusers: and when a warrant from the queen arrived, with an order for his conveyance to the Tower, his courage wholly failed him, and he implored mercy in the most abject terms.[1] It was a pitiable sight: the foremost peer in all the realm, the hope of Catholic Christendom—who, with the aid of Alva's veterans, was to restore the British Islands to the Church — begging for life and liberty like the meanest malefactor. The suddenness of the charges made against him, and the unexpected disclosures of his servants, may account in some measure for the utter loss of self-possession which he displayed. But successful rebels are made of sterner stuff; and Alva had rightly read the character of the duke when he pronounced him unfitted for the part Ridolphi had assigned him.

The prospects of Mary were now darker than at any period of her history. The most unfortunate of a race pre-eminent for its misfortunes, her evil destiny

[1] Murdin, 150; letter of Sir R. Sadler, Sir T. Smith, and Dr Wilson, to Burghley: "This day after dinner we came to the duke, and have taken his examination, who very humbly behaved himself, on his knees submitting himself with tears to her highness's mercy; declaring great sorrow that he hath so offended," &c.

was in nothing more conspicuous than in the characters of the men with whom, from circumstances rather than from choice, her lot from time to time was cast. Francis II. was a sickly boy; Darnley was a fool; Bothwell was a ruffian; and Norfolk, whom at this time she certainly regarded as her affianced husband, had shown himself to be little better than a coward. Nor was she more fortunate in her political advisers. Murray and Maitland had both basely betrayed her confidence; and the indiscreet zeal of the Bishop of Ross, by entangling her in the meshes of a plot which from the first gave no reasonable promise of success, had now involved her in the utmost peril. That she was fully justified in attempting at this time to recover her liberty, was admitted even by Lord Burghley himself; but the discovery of the conspiracy furnished him and his adherents with a fresh plea for their past hostility to the Scottish queen; and what was much more important, it effectually prevented the question of her restoration being again entertained for many years to come.

Immediately after the duke's arrest, Burghley addressed a letter to Shrewsbury which is well worthy of attention. The earl was desired to inform his prisoner that the Queen of England was aware that she had sought, with the aid of the Duke of Norfolk, to make her escape to Spain; "yet," adds the secretary, "her majesty thinks it no just cause *to be offended with these devices tending to her liberty.*" This admission is so important that we are much surprised so cautious a politician should have made it to any one; for it followed of necessity that if Elizabeth had no just cause to complain of the efforts of her prisoner to

recover her liberty, there was no just cause for her detention. "But," continued Cecil, "the very matter of offence is that her majesty understands certainly her labours and devices to stir up a new rebellion in this realm, and to have the King of Spain to assist it."[1] "And so in this sort, *her majesty would have you tempt her patience to provoke her to answer somewhat*, for of all these premises her majesty is certainly assured."[2]

In these instructions we discover a new feature of Burghley's policy. He could not venture to employ the rack or the thumbscrew at Sheffield Castle, but he would force his victim to speak out by a process perhaps more effective still. She was enfeebled by illness, most probably rendered irritable by continued disappointments; and he would have her keeper play the part both of inquisitor and spy, and by watching, and working on her temper, provoke a highly sensitive woman in some unguarded moment to disclose her secrets or to betray her friends. But Mary was no spoiled child of fortune to cry out like Norfolk at the sight of danger. Her bitter experience of the past four years had furnished her, apparently, with an inexhaustible supply of fortitude and patience; and when Shrewsbury, in obedience to his orders, sought to "provoke her to answer somewhat," she gave him an answer both prompt and clear, but by no means

[1] This information Burghley must have obtained through Fitzwilliam, for the letters of Ridolphi never fell into his hands.

[2] Lodge, i. 543. This letter is erroneously printed in Lodge under the date of September 1572, but the contents clearly show that it was written in 1571, immediately after the discovery of the Norfolk conspiracy. The error has arisen from Burghley having omitted the year when dating the letter.

such a one as Burghley or his mistress expected or desired.

Three days after the date of Cecil's letter, Shrewsbury demanded an interview with his prisoner. He then proceeded to inform her that her attempts to effect her escape had been discovered; that it was further known that she had sought, by means of foreign aid, to stir up a rebellion in England; that she had offered to send her son to Spain, and that she herself contemplated a marriage with Don Carlos. He informed her further that, in consequence of these discoveries, he had received orders to curtail the degree of liberty she had hitherto enjoyed, and to reduce the number of her attendants to sixteen; that all above that number must take their departure forthwith—such as were natives of Scotland to return thither, and such as were French to retire to France. That she might be the more unguarded in any reply she might make to this harsh message, Shrewsbury had taken the precaution that none of her servants or attendants should be present at the interview.

But Mary was in no ways discomposed. She replied to her keeper on the spot that she had come of her own free-will to England, relying on the promises of friendship and hospitality received from his mistress, but that she had been treated as a prisoner ever since; that although she was an independent sovereign, accountable neither to the Queen of England nor to any one else, she had been willing to enter into a treaty for her restoration; and it was preposterous that, because his mistress had failed to keep her word, she should now complain of her attempts to obtain her liberty by other means. It was true that she had

sought assistance from the Kings of France and Spain to aid her in recovering her authority in her own dominions, but it was false that she had stirred up rebellion in the dominions of his mistress. As to her alleged offer to send her son to Spain, that was an affair with which the Queen of England had no concern; but the rumour was untrue, and for this sufficient reason, that her son was not in her power, and it was not her custom to make promises she was unable to perform. The offer, such as it was, came not from her, but from her dear friend the late Queen of Spain,[1] whose letters were still in her possession, and who a short time before her death had proposed a marriage between her daughter and the Prince of Scotland. She was now, she added, about to be deprived of the little liberty she still enjoyed, and against this fresh act of tyranny she solemnly protested in the name of heaven.[2]

To Lord Burghley himself, on the following day, she addressed a spirited remonstrance. She reminded him that she had not failed "one jot of the promises" she had made to him and to Sir Walter Mildmay at Chatsworth, and that it had ever been her sincere desire to carry out the provisions of the treaty. She complained of her close confinement at Sheffield, which was most injurious to her health, and of the proposed reduction in the number of her servants. Not one of them dared to return to Scotland—for in the eyes of her enemies their fidelity to her was

[1] Elizabeth of France, third wife of Philip, and daughter of Henry II. She had been educated along with Mary, and they remained constant friends until the death of Elizabeth, which took place in 1568. —Labanoff, iii. 230, note.

[2] Labanoff, iii. 364.

an unpardonable crime; and the Earl of Shrewsbury refused to furnish them with passports to France. What, she asked, was to become of William Douglas, who had saved her life at Lochleven? Was he to be butchered like the rest? And her "French servants who had served her faithfully for so many years, were they to be deprived at once of their means of existence? Even when she was kept a close prisoner and in danger of her life at Lochleven, they were allowed to remain in Scotland; now they were to be dispersed, she knew not where. She finally declared that if they persevered in their cruel treatment of her and her poor servants, she would to her latest hour, before both God and man, assert that his mistress and her ministers were the authors of her death."[1]

It is hardly necessary to say that Burghley and his mistress remained deaf to these appeals. Indeed, the terms actually imposed upon the captive queen were still harsher than those at first announced by Shrewsbury. He had informed Mary that the number of her servants and attendants was to be reduced to sixteen; but on the following day, in consequence, no doubt, of fresh instructions, he, to use his own words, "told her roundly that all above the number of ten persons must depart from her, and that with speed."[2] Mary seems to have regarded this fresh announcement as the prelude to her death, and she naturally expressed her apprehensions to her keeper, as well as an earnest hope that if his mistress had resolved to take her life, she would at least allow her to confer with a minister of her own religion, that

[1] Labanoff, iii. 372. [2] Wright, i. 396.

the world might know that she died a Christian woman, a true prince, and in the Catholic faith which she professed." We learn from this request that, in addition to her sufferings, all spiritual aid was persistently denied to her.

Shrewsbury assured her that her life was in no danger, and requested her to select the ten attendants whom she wished to retain in her service. But, overcome with sorrow and resentment at the arbitrary and capricious orders of her keeper, she refused to make any selection. "She answered for anything that I could do," says Shrewsbury, "that she would name none; 'Let the queen,' saith she, 'do with me what she will.'"[1] Out of thirty-nine servants and attendants of the Scottish queen, Shrewsbury accordingly himself selected the required number.

In the course of the following week her dismissed attendants took their departure; but in the interval —in consequence, apparently, of Mary's energetic remonstrance — Elizabeth relented, and they were all allowed to proceed to France. On their taking their leave, Mary addressed to them, in writing, an affectionate farewell. After expressing her sorrow for the loss of their faithful services, she informed them that she had written to her ambassador in Paris on their behalf, which was the only service it was now in her power to render them. "I desire," she continued, "that you entreat my uncles to use their influence with the king, the queen-mother, and the Duke of Anjou, on behalf of my poor subjects, and if I die in this place, to take my son under their protection, in accordance with the ancient league between France

[1] Wright, i. 397; letter of 9th September.

and Scotland. Commend me to Lord Fleming, to the Archbishop of Glasgow, to George Douglas, and all my faithful subjects. Tell them to be of good courage, and not to be cast down by my misfortunes. Let all of them do their utmost to procure aid for our friends from every quarter, and not indulge in unavailing fears regarding me; for I am well content to bear all kinds of sufferings, even death itself, rather than betray the independence of my country. If I die, I shall only regret that I shall be without the means of recompensing their services and the sacrifices they have made for me. I trust that in this case God will not leave them unrewarded, and that my son and my allies among the Catholic princes will take them under their protection. And you, William Douglas,"[1] she continued, "rest assured that the life which was hazarded for mine shall never be rendered destitute so long as I possess a friend in all the world. Do not, I advise you, part company for the present, but go in a body to my ambassador in France, and give him all the information in your power respecting me and mine. With an afflicted heart I pray to God that in His infinite mercy He may protect my country and my faithful subjects, that He may pardon those who have so cruelly persecuted me, and that He may graciously enable both you and me to conform in all things to His will."[2]

It would have been much more merciful to their prisoner, it would have spared them a world of anxiety

[1] Lord Fleming, George Douglas, and William Douglas were all Protestants.

[2] Labanoff, iii. 378-382.

and trouble, and it would in no degree have injured their reputation with posterity, if, instead of prolonging her unhappy life, Burghley and his mistress had now anticipated by sixteen years the tragedy of Fotheringhay. That he would willingly have consented to the death of the Scottish queen at this time is certain. So long as she lived, and more especially so long as she lived in England, he professed to believe that his mistress and his religion were in perpetual danger; and this conviction was no doubt strengthened by a lively sense of private interest. He knew that if his mistress died, her cousin was next in succession to the crown. He further knew, and she too knew, that from the hour when she first set foot in England, he had been the most constant, energetic, and persevering of her enemies. He had done his best to destroy her reputation; he had urged Elizabeth to deprive her of her liberty, if not to take her life. Could he ever hope for her forgiveness should she one day become his sovereign? And was he not, in accordance with the savage maxims of the age, bound to secure himself by any practicable means against so obvious a danger? To his chief colleagues in the Council, to Leicester and Bedford, to Bacon and Sadler, the same remarks apply. All were new men, who owed their political power and their worldly prosperity to the Reformation; and all had reason to tremble for their lives and fortunes in the event, by no means improbable, of Mary Stewart ascending the English throne. Although in Scotland she had treated her enemies with singular forbearance and humanity, her subsequent experience might possibly induce her to adopt a different policy. Such we may suppose to have been the

secret sentiments of Burghley and his friends; for if it is true that we hate those we have injured, it is no less true that we place but small reliance on their generosity should they ever have it in their power to injure us.

The motives which influenced Elizabeth in her treatment of her kinswoman were, as her conduct clearly showed, of a much more complicated and fluctuating kind. The policy of Burghley and his friends was one of steady and vigilant hostility, varying in intensity according to circumstances, but never swerving from the point. They had regarded with unmixed satisfaction the deposition of Mary and her imprisonment at Lochleven. But we have seen that Elizabeth, instead of sharing the sentiments of her ministers, to her lasting credit regarded the situation of her sister queen with genuine sympathy, as well as with genuine sorrow, for the unworthy part she had taken in contributing to her misfortunes.[1] When, in opposition to the wishes of her advisers, she invited her rival to seek an asylum in England, we have no reason to doubt the sincerity of her motives; and when Mary, relying on her warm professions of friendship, resolved, in an evil hour for both, to accept her proffered hospitality, none but the bitterest enemies of the English queen can believe that she deliberately intended to entrap her unsuspecting guest. But from the moment of Mary's arrival in England, the conduct of Elizabeth became once more perplexed. Her ministers assured her that the liberty of the Queen of Scots was incompatible with her own security. The earnestness and the unanimity with which this opinion was expressed, induced her to

[1] Vol. i. 359.

waver; and she finally, as she too often did, allowed her fears to overpower her judgment. But although she consented to the detention of her sister queen, it is by no means probable that she regarded the prospect of her succeeding to the English crown with the same lively apprehensions as her ministers. She had nothing to fear from that event, provided it took place in the course of nature; and as for the rival religions, she would certainly in her heart have preferred the Papists to the Puritans. It is easy, therefore, to perceive on many occasions a conflict both of policy and interest between her and her ministers regarding the Scottish queen. Years of unwearied perseverance at length enabled Burghley and his friends to triumph in the contest; and it is to their account that posterity will charge the chief share in the guilt of Mary's murder.

For several months after the departure of her servants, she was treated with a degree of harshness which threatened soon to put an end to her existence. At the present day, we allow our convicted felons a sufficient amount of air and exercise to preserve them in bodily health; we supply them with medicine when they are sick; and we furnish them both in health and in sickness with abundant means of spiritual instruction and advice. But all these privileges were denied to the prisoner at Sheffield, who was proved to have done nothing except what Burghley himself declared she had a right to do. Active by temperament, and from her early youth delighting much in outdoor exercises, she was now strictly confined to her own apartments. She was only at times allowed, as an especial favour, to breathe the air of heaven from the leads of her prison; and on such occasions she was in-

variably accompanied by her keeper and his termagant countess, the famous Bess of Hardwick.[1] All intercourse between her attendants and those of the earl was prohibited; her correspondence was intercepted; and among the petty indignities to which she was subjected, she complains that her linen and that of her ladies, instead of being intrusted to women as formerly, was examined by the porters of her "wretched prison."[2] Still Elizabeth was not yet satisfied. She addressed at this time a long letter to Mary, in which, with truly feminine logic, she reproached her prisoner, among other matters, with the cost of her maintenance.[3] This coarse taunt, ridiculous although it now appears, seems to have touched the pride of the captive queen; for some time afterwards she expressed to Shrewsbury, with indiscreet generosity, her willingness to defray the expenses of her own imprisonment.[4] But Elizabeth, satisfied with inflicting needless annoyance on her prisoner, thought fit to let the matter drop. She probably saw that if Mary defrayed the cost of her maintenance, and that of her attendants, it would be impossible to refuse them a greater amount of liberty than they had hitherto enjoyed.

The close confinement to which Mary was now subjected would have been alone sufficient to undermine

[1] Shrewsbury to Burghley; Wright, i. 401.

[2] Mary to Fénelon, 7th November; Labanoff, iii. 394.

[3] Elizabeth to Mary, 1st February 1572; Ellis, iii. 1, 2d series.

[4] That she was "rather desirous to bear her own charges."—Shrewsbury to Walsingham; Lodge, ii. 28. We learn from a letter of Morgan, Mary's agent in Paris, that she had a clear revenue from her properties in France of 30,000 crowns a-year.—See Murdin, 495. It would have taken fully a third of her income to have defrayed her expenses, and that of her attendants and guards, at Sheffield Castle. Castelnau estimated these at 12,000 crowns a-year.—Teulet, iii. 87.

the strongest frame; and severely aggravated as her sufferings were by mental distress, we need not be surprised that her health declined with alarming rapidity. In the beginning of December, her physician[1] applied in the most urgent terms to Burghley for various medicines, which he deemed essential for his patient; and he added that unless she was allowed more air and exercise, his prescriptions would avail but little. We can well imagine the stoical composure[2] with which the secretary received this news. Shrewsbury had done his duty admirably well. It was only necessary to persevere a little longer, and without the aid of the assassin, without the scandal and the danger of a public trial, they would be relieved for ever of their arch-enemy.[3] Mary's physician accordingly received no answer to his application, and Elizabeth was most probably kept in ignorance of its existence.

[1] His letter is in the Cotton Library; Caligula, c. iii. 213. The original is in Latin; a translation has been published by Miss Strickland, Lives of the Queens of Scotland, vii. 151.

[2] "He can tell you how straitly the Queen of Scots is kept, having now but ten persons of her own of all sorts. She pretendeth a great fear of her life, and craveth a ghostly father, being Catholic."—Burghley to Walsingham, 7th December 1571; Digges, 152.

[3] This language may appear to some of my readers unwarrantable; but that the hostility of Burghley to the Queen of Scots was both deep and strong, is a matter beyond dispute. It appears that the secretary was even capable of *inventing* the most odious calumnies against her. We find that, after the murder of Riccio, he informed M. Paul de Foix, the French ambassador in London, that the Italian had been killed by Darnley in the act of committing adultery with the queen. Mr Allan Crosbie, in his preface to the Calendar of State Papers (Foreign series) for the year 1566, truly remarks, that when Cecil told this story, he knew perfectly well the real circumstances under which the murder had been committed. He knew, from Randolph's and Bedford's letters, that it was a political, and not a domestic crime. Yet the French ambassador implicitly believed the slanderous tale which had been told to him, as we may learn from his reply to Burghley, which was as follows:—

But Mary was endowed with powers of endurance far beyond the calculations of her keepers. It even appeared that her spirit rose as her bodily health declined, and that each new indignity to which she

"Cum tuū nuntiū intempesta nocte post secūdam vigiliam graviter quatientem ostiū semisomnus audirem stupore repente correptus totus exhorrui. Acceptis vero literis tuis cum in eorum initio viderem purgandi tui causa multas adferre excusationes, valdeque diffidenter et quasi reffugientem vix tandem narrationem inchoase, quod deterius erat (ut fere fit) Scoticam in æternā clausisse lumina noctem sum suspicatus. Cum vero ea quae narrabantur mīora concepta opinione viderem, leviora, quae per se gravissima erant, visa sūt. *Quid enim gravius esse potest, quā deforme et villissimū mācipiū a marito reginā nefario stupro polluēs deprehensum ab ejusqz manibus vix avulsū, multorū, indignitate rei permotorū, ictibus necatū esse:* eūdemque maritū, contūelia tam acerba neglecta, clā noctu cū eādem, ab iis qui eū quo poterāt dignitatis ornamēto honestare cupiebant, aufugisse: & quod est deterius quem auxilii causa evocarat, et quocū firmæ pactiones intercesserant, tanquā de se male meritū inimicū atque hoste appellasse. Cui quātum ego existimo, nihil conducibilius evenire potuit: Cū eo tempore quo minimū illi officere quivit, suā mobilitatem et levitatē ita prodiderit, ut in posterū illi minus fidens falli nequeat. Verum hæc mihi acerbissima accidere, quod illi reginæ bene cupiā, et tantas eam contrahere culpas iniquissimo animo feram. Nam multa in ea erant egregia ad virtutem quæ maximopere et iis qui illi parēt, et amicis, et christiano orbi adjūento et ornamēto esse potuissent, si illis recte uti quā abuti maluisset. Sed revera ita solent christianæ religionis desertores dū ad Dei hostem transfugiūt, ab eo execati in hos tragicos furores impelli. Scriptū enim est, tenere eū captivas mētes impiorū. Tu tamē, quod existimo suasor eris et impulsor Reginæ tuæ, ut labantē et ferme prostatā, quātum in ea erit, fulciat et erigat. Ita tamē ne aliis ruinæ occasiōem præbeat. Nam pietas et virtus pura, simplex et aperta, dum ex sua natura cæteros fingit credulitate sua, in hominū versutorū et multipliciū laqueos facīle incidit. Et hoc est quod traditur, filios hujus seculi prudentiores in generatiōe sua filiis lucis: Ego certe illi simul et piis omnibus optime cōsultū esse velim, ut tamē ex horum casu et pernicie majorē sim dolorē accepturus. Cæterum agnosco humāitem tuam quod ita amāter et aperte de istis rebus, quae me maxime solicitū habent, scripseris et rogo ut si quid ex illo tempore ad te perlatū est, vel huic, cui tuto comittere potes, dicas: vel literis scribas, quod cōmodo tamē tuo & salva fide fieri possit.

"Vale et me semper ama—decimo Calendas Aprilis.

"Tui amātissimus & ex animo tuus

"Paul de Foix.

"(In dorso) 23 Martii 1565. The Fr. Emb to my Mr. Monsr. Monsr.

was exposed supplied her with fresh courage. Buchanan's 'Detection' had been published in London in the beginning of this winter, under the auspices of Burghley; and a copy of the libel, which first appeared in Latin, was presented to the captive queen by one of his emissaries named Bateman. Whether he sent it of his own accord, or whether it was intended as a Christmas present from his mistress, we do not know; but Mary received with quiet scorn this filthy token of the malice of her enemies. She had asked, she said, for a priest to administer to her the holy sacrament, and they sent instead an obscene book written by that atheist Buchanan,[1] whom her rebels in Scotland had intrusted with the education of her son. Of the utter baseness of the man, whom she had raised from indigence to wealth, and who had now become the hired slanderer of his benefactress, she did not deign to speak. The ingratitude of those she had befriended in the days of her prosperity had ceased to excite resentment or surprise. But she appealed to the King of France, and

Cecille Principal Secrete^r. de la Royne d Angre. et Conseill en son Prive Conseil."—Foreign State Papers, France, 1566, vol. xxxix.

"I certify that the foregoing is a true and authentic copy.

"H. J. SHARPE,

"Assist.-Keeper of Public Records.

"23d Decr. 1872."

Why Burghley should have thus ventured to impose upon the French ambassador is easily explained. Paul de Foix was known to incline to the Huguenot doctrines (see Teulet, ii. 175, note), and he would therefore the more readily give credit to the atrocious calumny which, if Mary had not defeated the schemes of Riccio's assassins, would no doubt have been speedily circulated throughout Europe.

As it is, we may infer from Burghley's conduct on this occasion that, if the plot had succeeded, the queen's enemies would have been quite prepared to produce evidence of her guilt with Riccio, as they afterwards produced the casket in proof of her guilt with Bothwell.

[1] Labanoff, iv. 5.

through him to all Christian princes, against this fresh and monstrous outrage. Lord Burghley, however, had been beforehand with her. He had privately sent abroad [1] copies of Buchanan's libel; and when Fénelon, in obedience to his instructions, requested Elizabeth to suppress the publication, she pretended that it was not in her power to do so, as the book had been printed in Scotland [2] and in Germany. She then artfully changed the subject by complaining in her turn of Fénelon's correspondence with Mary's partisans in Scotland, a fact which he made no attempt to deny. But it was in vain that he sought to recover the 2000 crowns which the Shrewsbury carrier had placed in Burghley's hands, and which in reality belonged to the Queen of Scots.[3] Everything in the shape of treasure, whether great or small, and whether seized on sea or land, was deemed lawful prize by Elizabeth; and the only answer Fénelon could obtain was, that the money "must be demanded of them to whom he delivered it"[4]—in other words, from Higford, who was at the time a close prisoner in the Tower.

When Elizabeth told the French ambassador that the 'Detection' had been published in Scotland and in Germany, she not only knew the statement to be untrue, but she knew that at the time an English edition of the book was being prepared by Dr Thomas Wilson, Master of the Court of Requests,

[1] See in Digges, 151, his letter to Walsingham in Paris, sending "the little treatise." He adds, "I hear it is to be translated into English, with addition of many other supplements." When Burghley wrote this, he knew that he himself had employed Dr Wilson to translate it.

[2] Fénelon, iv. 305. [3] Ibid.

[4] Digges, 138. Burghley says the French ambassador was "much offended" with the answer.

under the immediate eye of Burghley.[1] The 'Detection' was in fact little more than a paraphrase of the Book of Articles,[2] with a declamatory rhapsody[3] appended to it, of which a specimen has already been presented to the reader. It was published at this time for the obvious purpose of reviving the now forgotten slanders against the Scottish queen; but it is to be observed that, although Bishop Leslie's Defence of his mistress had appeared upwards of six months before, the author of the 'Detection' made no attempt at a reply. The bishop, in his Defence, had made two allegations, which, if true, were decisive of the matter in dispute. He asserted that the letters produced at Westminster, and so carefully withheld from the inspection of his mistress, were forged;[4] and he further asserted that Paris, the only witness whose testimony directly implicated the queen, publicly proclaimed her innocence in presence of the multitude assembled at his execution.[5] Upon both of these points Buchanan is discreetly silent. He says not a word in proof of the authenticity of the letters; nor does he once refer to the all-important testimony of Paris. Yet, if the statement made by the bishop was untrue, no one was better entitled to contradict it than Buchanan. His name, as we have seen, is appended as a witness to the so-called deposition of the French page;[6] but, as they never ventured to produce this extraordinary docu-

[1] Goodall, ii. 371.

[2] See vol. i., Appendix B.

[3] The Oration, see vol. i. 170.

[4] See Leslie's Defence in Anderson.

[5] "For as for him that ye surmise was the bearer of them" (the letters to Bothwell), "and whom you have executed of late for the said murder, he at the time of his said execution took it upon his death, as he should answer before God, that he never carried any such letters, nor that the queen was participant," &c.—Anderson.

[6] See vol. i. 249 *et seq.*

ment,[1] the statement of the bishop, for the best of reasons, remained unchallenged.

That indefatigable partisan of Mary was at this time a prisoner in the Tower. There had also been arrested on suspicion the Earls of Arundel and Southampton, the Lord Lumley, Lord Cobham the Lord Warden, Sir Thomas and Sir Edward Stanley, sons of the Earl of Derby; and various other persons of inferior rank. That they were amenable to the law was certain; but how to deal with the Bishop of Ross was another question. It was now well known that he was implicated in the Ridolphi plot. But he had been received by Elizabeth as the representative of an independent princess; and the only punishment which, by the usages of Christendom, could, in any case, be inflicted on an ambassador, was expulsion from the country to which he was accredited. Thomas Randolph had been detected some five years before in practices still more treasonable than those which could be proved against the Bishop of Ross; and Mary, in accordance with established rule, simply sent the English envoy out of her dominions. But expediency was the sole rule of Elizabeth's policy, and the liberties of individuals and the rights of nations were held of no account when weighed against the supposed necessities of the hour. The bishop had long been an object of suspicion. He was naturally believed to be in posses-

[1] On the 8th November 1571, we find Dr Wilson writing to Lord Burghley requesting him to "send unto me *Paris closely sealed*, and it shall not be known whence it cometh."—Murdin, 57. Why Paris should have been kept closely sealed we can well understand.—See vol. i. 249. There was probably at this time some notion of publishing the deposition of Paris along with the 'Detection,' but we may assume that Burghley was too prudent to allow the queen's enemies to make so flagrant an exposure of their folly and falsehood.

sion of many dangerous secrets; and in spite of his privilege of an ambassador, and in spite of the safe-conduct he had received before he entered England,[1] it was determined to treat him as an ordinary criminal, and to force him to divulge all he knew. A pretext for this extraordinary proceeding was soon discovered by Lord Burghley. He obtained an opinion from certain doctors of civil law, who maintained that an ambassador taking the part of rebels against the sovereign to whom he was accredited, might be punished like a private individual.[2] If this opinion was correct, Randolph ought to have been executed in Scotland when he was detected aiding Murray's rebellion; but it seems that Mary knew the law of nations better than the servile doctors consulted by Lord Burghley. Such as it was, however, their opinion satisfied the Council; and the bishop was informed that he must divulge all he knew, or be subjected to torture like any ordinary criminal. He protested vehemently against this flagrant injustice, and appealed for protection to Elizabeth. Ashamed apparently of the proceeding, she privately sent him word that if he would submit to be examined his testimony should be regarded as confidential, and should not be produced against his mistress or her friends.[3] With this assurance he at length consented to answer a vast number of questions propounded to him by the Council; and

[1] See Murdin, 55.

[2] "We are of opinion that an ambassador procuring an insurrection or rebellion in the prince's country towards whom he is ambassador, ought not, *jure gentium et civili Romanorum*, to enjoy the privileges otherwise due to an ambassador, but that he may notwithstanding be punished for the same."—Murdin, 18. No authority or precedent is given for this remarkable opinion.

[3] Leslie's Negotiations, in Anderson.

such credit as can be attached to testimony extorted in secret by threats of violence, and afterwards produced by those who so obtained it, will be given by the impartial reader to his examination.

Reference has already been made to the most important piece of evidence said to have been elicited from the bishop against his mistress in the course of these proceedings. It was to the effect that, during the conference at York in 1568, Maitland privately sent her word that the Regent Murray was bent upon producing the evidence he possessed against her, and that she wished him "to stay these rigorous accusations"—the inference being plain that she was afraid to meet them. But we cannot allow this account of a conversation, more than three years old, and obtained by such suspicious means, to weigh for a moment against the letter of the Earl of Sussex, which was written confidentially to Cecil on the spot. Sussex at York, with the full knowledge of all that was passing around him, stated that Murray was most reluctant to produce his proofs, lest the tables should be turned against him;[1] and it has been clearly shown that Sussex was right, and that the regent was only forced at last to exhibit his casket by one of the many ingenious "practices" of Cecil.

That the secretary and his friends should display at this time a spirit of intense hostility against the Bishop of Ross we should naturally expect; but that they should discover a strong similarity of character between him and their former ally the Regent Murray may occasion some surprise. Such, however, was the fact. In a letter to Lord Burghley, Sir Thomas Smith and Dr Wilson thus describe the bishop and his proto-

[1] See letter of Sussex; vol. i., Appendix A.

type: "A very firebrand of sedition, *such a one as your lordship knew one was who now is dead.* They two had been able to have set two realms together by the ears, the one with the zeal of Papistry, *the other with the contrary,* and both to serve their turn of ambition rather than of any other devotion."[1] It would thus appear that the true character of Murray was thoroughly understood by his English confederates, and that in private they made no secret of their opinion, although in public it was necessary to speak in very different terms of the godly regent.

The Spanish ambassador was quite as deeply implicated in the Ridolphi plot as the Bishop of Ross; and if the legal opinion obtained by Lord Burghley was correct, it is plain that D'Espés ought also to have been sent to the Tower, and examined at the peril of his life. But the King of Spain was in a very different position from the captive Queen of Scotland; and the glorious and decisive victory won by Don John of Austria over the Ottoman fleet at Lepanto in the autumn of this year,[2] promised to render Philip as power-

[1] Murdin, 102. The regent is not named in the letter, but the description can apply to no one else.

[2] The battle, which was fought on the 7th of October 1571, is thus described by Mr Motley: "The fleet was arranged in three divisions. The Ottomans, not drawn up in crescent form as usual, had the same triple disposition. Barberigo and the other Venetians commanded on the left, John Andrew Doria on the right, while Don John himself and Colonna were in the centre. Crucifix in hand, the high admiral rowed from ship to ship, exhorting generals and soldiers to show themselves worthy of a cause which he had persuaded himself was holy. Fired by his eloquence and by the sight of the enemy, his hearers answered with eager shouts, while Don John returned to his ship, knelt on the quarter-deck, and offered a prayer. He then ordered the trumpets to sound the assault, commanded his sailing-master to lay him alongside the Turkish admiral, and the battle began. The Venetians, who were first attacked, destroyed ship after ship of their assailants after a close and

ful on the sea as he already was on land. Burghley could not venture to set the law of nations at defiance by imprisoning the ambassador of the most powerful monarch in the world. But Don Gueraldo was summoned before the Council to answer for his conduct, where, to the astonishment of all, and without apology or explanation, he boldly denounced Lord Burghley as the real disturber of the public peace, and declared that he, and he alone, was the cause of the estrangement between his mistress and the King of Spain. Don Gueraldo, instead of waiting to be accused, became thus unexpectedly the accuser; and there was so much truth in the charges he had preferred, that the secretary, to use his own words, "replied in more modest terms than he deserved."[1] The Spanish ambassador knew well that his master had sought no quarrel with the Queen of England. In the Netherlands, in the Levant, and in America, he had already abundant work upon his hands. He was therefore sincerely desirous of peace with Elizabeth; but, as every one believed, at the instigation of Burghley, she had plundered

obstinate contest; but Barberigo fell dead ere the sunset, with an arrow through his brain. Meantime the action, immediately after the first onset, had become general. From noon till evening the battle raged with a carnage rarely recorded in history. Don John's own ship lay yard-arm and yard-arm with the Turkish admiral, and exposed to the fire of seven large vessels besides. It was a day when personal audacity, not skilful tactics, was demanded, and the imperial bastard showed the metal he was made of. The Turkish admiral's ship was destroyed, his head exposed from Don John's deck upon a pike, and the trophy became the signal for a general panic and a complete victory. By sunset the battle had been won. Of nearly three hundred Turkish galleys, but fifty made their escape. From twenty-five to thirty thousand Turks were slain, and perhaps ten thousand Christians."—Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic, iii. 139.

[1] Digges, 162.

his commerce, laid waste his colonies, intercepted his treasure, subsidised his rebels, and even converted an English seaport into a mart for the sale of Spanish prisoners whose friends were rich enough to pay a ransom for their freedom.[1] All this Don Gueraldo knew; but he did not know in addition that he and his master had been egregiously duped and swindled by Hawkins and Fitzwilliam, with the aid of Burghley, or his language would probably have been still more strong. As it was, the Earl of Sussex, who seems to have been the ablest of all Elizabeth's ministers, made a speech in Italian, in which Don Gueraldo was informed that he must quit England with all convenient speed. He embarked, accordingly, at Gravesend a few days afterwards; and Burghley arranged, with playful treachery,[2] that the vessel which carried him to France was commanded by Sir John Hawkins, whom he still believed to be his friend. During the voyage the old buccaneer, who no doubt enjoyed the joke, was profuse in his professions of attachment to the King of Spain, and left the ambas-

[1] See Froude, x. 240.

[2] That Burghley in his younger days was given to practical jokes, and that he could turn them on occasion to a practical account, we learn from a very partial biographer. It appears that while he was a student at Gray's Inn, the future secretary lost all his money, as well as his bedding and his books, one night at play, to a neighbour who occupied the adjoining chambers. To recover his property he had recourse to a device which is thus described by his biographer: "With a long trompe he made a hole in the wall near his playfellow's bed-head, and in a fearful voice thus spoke through the trompe, 'O mortal man! repent! repent of thy horrible time, consumed in play, cozenage, and lewdness, or else thou art damned, and cannot be saved!' Which, being spoken at midnight, when he was all alone, so amazed him, as drove him into a sweat for fear. Most penitent and heavy the next day, calling for Mr Cecill, asked him forgiveness on his knees, and restored all his money, bedding, and books," &c.—Quoted by Dr Nares, Life and Times of Lord Burghley, i. 59.

sador at Calais in the firm belief that he had purchased for his master the services of the first of English seamen.

While the prospects of Mary were thus darkening on every side, events of much importance had taken place in Scotland. During the negotiations for the Chatsworth treaty, a truce had been agreed upon between her adherents and those of the regent. It expired on the last day of March; and before that time Lennox, whose headquarters were at Glasgow, had resolved upon an enterprise which, if successful, promised materially to affect the progress of the contest.

During all the vicissitudes of the last four years, Lord Fleming, Protestant though he was, had faithfully held Dumbarton Castle for the queen. Perched on the summit of a precipitous rock, and commanding the navigation of the Clyde, the fortress was important as well from its natural strength as from the means which it afforded to the queen's adherents of keeping up their communications with the Continent. It was from Dumbarton that Mary, when a child of six years old, had sailed for France, in defiance of her imperious grand-uncle Henry VIII.; and the French ambassador in Scotland, M. de Verac, was at this time the guest of Lord Fleming. To lay siege to such a place, containing as it did a sufficient garrison and abundant supplies of every kind, must have been a tedious, costly, and uncertain operation; but a retainer of Lennox, named Thomas Crawford,[1] volunteered to attempt its capture by surprise. As Crawford had already earned a reputation for ability and daring, his

[1] The same person whose deposition was produced at Westminster in 1568.

offer was accepted; and it was determined that the attempt should be made on the night immediately following the expiration of the truce.

Crawford selected only a hundred men for the expedition. Among them was a soldier who had served in the castle, and who undertook to guide the assailants up the rock at the point where it was steepest, and where, accordingly, an attack was least expected. At nightfall, on the 1st of April, Crawford with his little band set out from Glasgow, and after an expeditious march they silently approached the fortress in single file some time before daybreak. A heavy mist, which in the early morning overhung the summit of the rock, while the base remained clear, enabled Crawford to commence his operations unobserved. By means of ladders and ropes, with which he was amply provided, he then contrived with a portion of his adventurous comrades to clamber up the face of the precipice, until, overcoming every obstacle, they gained at last a precarious footing at the base of the castle wall. They well knew that discovery at this point would have cost the lives of every man; and, breathless with their exertions, and listening intently for the faintest murmur from within, they at length fixed their ladders for the final effort. All was silent still, until Crawford, with his guide and a few of his more adventurous followers, sprang from the rampart, and, shouting the Lennox war-cry[1] with all their might, overpowered the nearest sentinel. The rest of the assailants quickly cleared the wall; and the panic-stricken garrison, roused from their slumbers in the grey dawn by the clash of arms and the shouts of their enemies, of whose

[1] "A Darnley! a Darnley!"

strength they were in utter ignorance, made hardly an attempt at resistance. Lord Fleming alone had the presence of mind in the confusion to effect his escape by a postern gate, and made his way in a boat across the Clyde. Crawford had no men to spare for the pursuit of the governor, for he had captured various prisoners of consequence, who required to be safely guarded. Among these was Lady Fleming, the Archbishop of St Andrews, the French ambassador De Verac, and John Hall, a gentleman of Derbyshire, who, two years before, had been concerned with Leonard Dacre and Sir Edward Stanley in the plot for carrying off the Queen of Scots from Wingfield. A goodly supply of arms, money, and provisions also fell into the hands of the victors, who were fortunate enough to achieve one of the most brilliant enterprises on record without the loss of a single man.[1]

Lennox could not venture to make a prisoner of the French ambassador, nor could he in decency detain Lady Fleming. But he did not scruple to deliver up the English fugitive to the Marshal of Berwick. With the Archbishop Hamilton the regent had a long account to settle, and the method was speedily determined. The unfortunate prelate represented the family whose pretensions to the Scottish crown had been declared to be superior to those of the house of Lennox; and his hereditary hatred of the name of Hamilton[2] was intensified by rumours, invented appa-

[1] Cecil, who was confined to his bed by gout at the time, expressed his utmost satisfaction at the capture of Dumbarton. "It is," he said, "of greater importance than Edinburgh Castle, considering it was *receptaculum* to all the queen's foreign aid."—Letter to Walsingham; Digges, 78. Dated by mistake 7th March, instead of 7th April.

[2] Lennox pretended that the Duke of Chatelherault was illegitimate

rently for the occasion, that the archbishop was the chief contriver of Darnley's murder. Partisans of the late regent, too, asserted that he had hired his kinsman Bothwellhaugh to play the assassin at Linlithgow; and Drury had insinuated that he had pronounced the divorce between Bothwell and his wife to pave the way for a marriage which was sure to bring ruin on the queen, and thus leave only her infant son between the Hamiltons and the crown. We have not the smallest proof that any one of these allegations was true; yet modern historians[1] have vied with Knox and Buchanan in the violence with which they have assailed the character of Archbishop Hamilton. They forget that in that age the most reckless and unfounded charges were made against every person, of whatever character or creed, who took a prominent part in public affairs; and it is a circumstance strongly in favour of this prelate that, notwithstanding the number and the malice of his enemies, their accusations are wholly unsupported by evidence upon which the smallest reliance can be placed. Of the crimes committed by his contemporaries—by Murray and Morton, by Maitland and Lennox—we have overwhelming proof; but the death of Walter Mill, the last of the few[2] victims

because his father had unlawfully divorced his first wife, and afterwards married Janet Beatoun, the mother of the duke. If the divorce was illegal, the house of Lennox, and not that of Hamilton, was next in succession to the crown after the Stewarts.—See Crawford's Peerage, 192. But the Parliament of Scotland had decided in favour of the Hamiltons.

[1] "He was believed to have instigated the tragedy of the Kirk-of-Field. His had been the head that planned the death of the regent, though the deed had been committed to the hand of another Hamilton." —Burton, v. 267. "It may be much to say that in all Scotland there was not one man who had better deserved a halter than the Archbishop of St Andrews."—Froude, x. 179.

[2] See vol. i. 22.

of Catholic persecution in Scotland, is the only specific charge for which the archbishop can be held responsible. And in an age when religious persecution was deemed a sacred duty, this act of intolerance can hardly, in the ordinary sense of the term, be regarded as a crime.

But Lennox required no proofs of the archbishop's guilt. It was enough, and more than enough, that he was a Hamilton; and the unfortunate prelate was, in the course of a few days after his capture, hurried off to Stirling, and without even the pretence of a trial, hanged on a gibbet like a common malefactor.[1]

Elated with his success, the regent now resolved to march upon Edinburgh; but after a feeble attempt to besiege the castle, he was forced to retire, leaving the capital entirely in the hands of his opponents. Having some reason to suspect the loyalty of the lord provost and bailies of the town, Kirkaldy even ventured to depose them all,[2] and nominated his son-in-law, the warlike Laird of Fernihirst, to the office of chief magistrate, with a council of his Border vassals to aid him in the performance of his duties.

Meanwhile Sir William Drury received orders from Elizabeth to proceed to Edinburgh and attempt to reconcile the rival factions; and he accordingly held various conferences with Kirkaldy, with Morton, and afterwards with Lennox. But it was shrewdly suspected by Sir James Melvill[3] that the real intention of the English ministers was, under the mask of mediation, to widen the breach between the parties; and he seems to have been justified in his opinion. There

[1] No record remains of his trial and sentence.—Burton, v. 265.

[2] Tytler, vii. chap. iv.

[3] Memoirs.

can be no doubt that the miserable state of anarchy to which Scotland was at this time reduced, was to be ascribed mainly, if not solely, to the intrigues of Elizabeth. But for the energetic support which she gave to Morton and to Lennox after Murray's death, the party of the queen must soon have been everywhere triumphant. As it was, the final issue of the contest was still doubtful; for in spite of the loss of Dumbarton, the southern counties were still loyal, and in the north Sir Adam Gordon was everywhere victorious.[1] But whatever may have been Elizabeth's intentions in sending Drury to Scotland at this time, it is certain that his visit was followed by a fierce renewal of the war, in which every kind of outrage was committed by the combatants on either side.

The young king was now five years old; and the regent determined to hold a Parliament at Stirling, at which his grandson should make his appearance in person. Every effort was made to secure a large attendance of the nobility, and on the 2d of September the session was opened with a degree of pomp which had not been witnessed since the deposition of the queen.[2] Kirkaldy, or more probably Maitland—whose singular influence over Grange at this time was attributed by the superstition of the age to enchantment—now perceived a tempting opportunity of avenging the capture of Dumbarton, and even of eclipsing that

[1] Richard Bannatyne, the secretary of Knox, speaking of a victory of Gordon over the Master of Forbes won in the autumn of this year, expresses himself as follows: "By means of this victory Adam Gordon thinks now to play the king; and goes about and takes all gentlemen's places that will not obey the queen; and so rules he all in the north, at this present, as he pleases. God shorten his time," &c.—Bannatyne's Memorials, 213.

[2] Historie of King James the Sext.

achievement by an exploit still more daring and decisive. Stirling was but a few hours' ride from Edinburgh, and by a rapid night-march, Lennox, with his chief supporters, and perhaps the young king himself, might all be captured on the spot, and the war thus brought to a close by one triumphant blow.[1] The leaders selected for this daring expedition were the Earl of Huntly, Lord Claude Hamilton, Fernihirst the newly-appointed Provost of Edinburgh, and the Laird of Buccleuch. Accompanied by four hundred horse they rode leisurely out of Edinburgh on the afternoon of the 3d of September; and, taking the road to Jedburgh, it was given out that they were about to occupy that town for the queen. But as soon as it was dark they wheeled off to the right, and made the best of their way to Stirling, which they approached before daybreak. Leaving their horses at some little distance from the town, they proceeded silently on foot, and entered the deserted streets without meeting an opponent. The house where the regent lodged was speedily surrounded, and he was made a prisoner before he could leave his bed. His chief supporters, including Argyll, who had once more changed sides, with the Earls of Glencairn, Cassilis, Eglinton, Montrose, and Buchan, and the Lords Sempill, Cathcart, and Ochiltree, shared the same fate. But the capture of Morton occasioned some delay, for on the first alarm he contrived to barricade the doors of his lodging, and courageously defended the house until it was set on fire by his assailants. He then surrendered himself a prisoner, begrimed with smoke and dust, to Buccleuch. Believing

[1] Maitland seems to have anticipated by nearly three centuries the famous Parisian plot of December 1851.

their victory to be now complete, the Borderers, according to their custom, commenced the work of pillage; and the numerous fine horses belonging to the nobility and their retainers offered an irresistible temptation to the men of Liddesdale, who emptied every stable with incredible rapidity,[1] and galloping off with their booty, left their leaders to guard the prisoners as they best might. This incident proved fatal to the expedition. The retainers of the regent, who now came flocking to the scene of action, perceiving the insignificant number of their opponents, became in their turn the assailants, and, aided by the Earl of Mar, who sallied opportunely from the castle with a body of fresh troops, speedily retook the whole of the prisoners. But in the confusion the regent received a mortal wound;[2] and with the shouts of his enemies, "Remember the archbishop," ringing in his ears, was carried to his lodgings, where he soon afterwards expired.

Of the leaders of this daring enterprise Buccleuch alone was captured, his comrades effecting their retreat with the loss of only nine men killed and sixteen prisoners. Their loss would have been much greater but for the singular activity of the Liddesdale moss-troopers, who had hardly left a horse behind them, and thus rendered pursuit impossible. The expedition had only failed through want of discipline; and, as it was, Kirkaldy was by no means dissatisfied with the result. He boasted that although Stirling was garrisoned with 2000 men, his troops had, with not a fifth

[1] Tytler, vii. 297 *et seq.*

[2] It is said that he was shot by a Captain Calder, who was afterwards broken on the wheel, a kind of punishment which never appears to have been known in England.—Tytler, vii. 299.

of the number, kept possession of the town for three hours, made prisoners of all the nobility, and carried off much valuable booty.[1]

As the Parliament was sitting, no time was lost in electing a new regent; and after some opposition on the part of Argyll, the Earl of Mar was raised to that dangerous post, which in less than two years had proved fatal to both his predecessors.

[1] Drury to Burghley, 13th Sept.; Record Office.

CHAPTER XVIII.

NORFOLK AND NORTHUMBERLAND.

THE Duke of Norfolk had, in accordance with the practice of the times, been subjected after his arrest to a series of rigorous examinations. In the course of these, although he admitted that he had broken his pledge by renewing his correspondence with the Queen of Scots, he emphatically denied that he had ever meditated treason against Elizabeth.[1] But the confessions of his servants, and of the Bishop of Ross, had convinced his mistress of the contrary; and the apparent determination of the first of her nobility to marry her rival in defiance of every obstacle, filled her with resentment and alarm. The examinations of the duke and his supposed accomplices were continued at intervals throughout the winter, and each fresh disclosure was carefully scrutinised by the queen. She even complained — and it is a matter of grave reproach against her—that her councillors used the rack too sparingly; and in one instance she expressly commanded them to persevere with the torture of two witnesses[2] against the duke, after the

[1] See his examinations in Murdin.

[2] Sir Thomas Smith, afterwards one of the Secretaries of State, who

Council believed that they had nothing further to disclose.

Lord Burghley was no less anxious than his mistress to bring the duke to justice. The ancient nobility had ever regarded Elizabeth's favourite minister as their enemy, and nothing would tend more to consolidate his power than the ruin of their acknowledged chief. The Crown lawyers were set to work, and it was resolved that Norfolk should be indicted for high treason. As Parliament was not sitting, the proper tribunal for the trial of a peer was the court of the High Steward; and after four months' close confinement, the duke, on the night of the 15th of January, received notice that on the next morning he was to be arraigned on the gravest charge known to the law of England.[1] Without legal advice, without books, without the smallest information as to the evidence or the witnesses to be produced against him, and denied the privilege of calling witnesses in his defence, he could not but conclude, when he received the summons, that his doom was already sealed.

The trial had been appointed to take place in Westminster Hall, in the upper part of which a raised platform had been erected for the accommodation of

speaks with becoming distaste of the task imposed upon him, expresses himself as follows in a letter to Lord Burghley: "Though we be importune to crave revocation from this unpleasant and painful toil, I pray you be not angry with us. I assure, for my part, I would not wish to be one of Homer's gods if I thought I should be Minos, Æacus, or Radamanthus; I had rather be one of the least *umbrae in Campis Elysiis*. I suppose we have gotten so much as at this time is like to be had; yet to-morrow do we intend to bring a couple of them to the rack, *not in any hope to get anything worthy that pain or fear, but because it is so earnestly commanded unto us.*"—Murdin, 95.

[1] In Scotland at this time the law of treason was more lenient. We have seen that Bothwell received fifteen days' notice.—See vol. i. 289.

the peers, the prisoner, and his accusers. The Earl of Shrewsbury, who had been summoned from Sheffield for the occasion, presided as Lord High Steward. The judges of the courts of common law sat as his assessors, and twenty-six peers were selected to pronounce upon the guilt or innocence of the accused. The demeanour of the duke, when he took his place at the bar in custody of the lieutenant of the Tower, was very different from that which he had exhibited before the Council on the first discovery of the plot. In the presence of his peers and of the citizens of London, with whom he was immensely popular, and who thronged the lower portion of the hall, he no longer played the part of the pusillanimous traitor, ready to purchase life at any price. He seemed now to bear in mind that he was the first subject in the realm, the son of the illustrious Surrey, and the kinsman of the queen.[1] Calmly scanning the countenances of the peers, he betrayed neither surprise nor alarm when he perceived amongst them his worst enemies in the Council. Burghley, the last created of the barons, was there, with his colleagues Bedford and Leicester; and seated by their side were Hertford and Huntingdon, both declared adversaries of the Scottish queen. These men were all to be his judges, yet for this gross injustice Norfolk knew there was no remedy; for by an inexplicable anomaly in the then existing law, the right of challenge, which might be claimed by every commoner, was denied to a peer in the court of the High Steward. Norfolk further knew that the lords were not required to be unanimous in the verdict they

[1] Her grandmother and his grandfather were both children of Thomas Howard, the second Duke of Norfolk.

pronounced, but that a bare majority of voices would decide his fate.[1]

After silence had been proclaimed, the indictment was read by the clerk of the Crown. It contained substantially two charges: first, that in defiance of her majesty's express commands the duke had sought to marry the Queen of Scots; and secondly, that he had sought, by means of foreign aid, to stir up a rebellion in the realm. Upon being called upon to plead, he entreated the court to allow him the aid of counsel. But the Chief-Justice Catline replied that in cases of high treason the law allowed no counsel to the accused. "My lords," rejoined Norfolk, "I am hardly handled in this proceeding. I have had very short warning to provide an answer to so great a matter—not fourteen hours in all. I have had short warning and no books, neither book of statutes nor so much as a breviate of the statutes. I am brought to fight without a weapon."[2] His remonstrances, however, were fruitless, and he finally pleaded "not guilty."

The queen's sergeant, Barham, then opened the case for the Crown, and maintained, in terms of the first charge in the indictment, that the design of the duke to marry the Queen of Scots was in itself "clear and palpable treason." The process of reasoning by which the Crown lawyers arrived at this conclusion may be stated thus: The Queen of Scots had worn the arms and pretended to the crown of England; she had never renounced that pretension: and whoever, therefore, sought to marry her, not only denied the title, but meditated the deposition and the death of the Queen of England.

[1] Jardine's Criminal Trial Remarks, 231. [2] State Trials, i. 966.

The crime of treason then was, and still is, defined by the statute of 25th of Edward III.[1] But it was only by a most unwarrantable interpretation of this Act that Norfolk, by seeking to marry the Queen of Scots, could be held to compass his sovereign's death; and he argued the point both with temper and ability. Being pressed by the queen's sergeant to confess that he knew the fact of Mary having worn the arms of England, he said, "I have heard without doubt that, being married to the French king, she made claim during her husband's life to the crown of England, and quartered the arms of England with those of Scotland and France. But I have also heard that Sir Nicolas Throgmorton, who was then ambassador in France, made complaint thereof, and that thereupon it was laid down."

To this the sergeant replied that she had never renounced the claim, although she had been repeatedly required to do so. He then, in direct breach of Queen Elizabeth's promise, read various portions of the examinations of the Bishop of Ross relative to the duke's proceedings during the conference at York. The sergeant charged him with violating his oath as a commissioner by making proposals of marriage to the Scottish queen, even although he believed her to be guilty of the crimes imputed to her. In proof of

[1] The words of the statute are: "Where a man doth compass or imagine the death of our lord the king, the lady his consort, or of their eldest son and heir; and if a man levy war against our said lord the king in his realm, or be adherent to the enemies of our lord the king in the realm, giving to them aid and support in his realm or elsewhere, and thereof be attainted upon due proof of open deed by people of their condition, be it known that in the cases above named there ought to be judgment of treason."—Translation by Luders.

this assertion, there was read an alleged confession of Bannister, the duke's steward, as follows: "I confess that I, waiting of my said lord and master, when the Earl of Sussex, and Vice-Chancellor of the duchy that now is, were in commission of York (which was in the month of October, in the tenth year of the queen's reign), did hear his grace say, that upon examination of the matter of the murder it did appear that the Queen of Scots was guilty, and privy to the murder of the Lord Darnley, her late husband; whereby I verily thought his grace would never join in marriage with her."[1]

"Bannister," interrupted the duke, "was shrewdly cramped when he told that tale. I beseech you, let me have him brought face to face."

"Bannister," rejoined the sergeant, "was no more tortured than yourself." This statement we know to be untrue. Sergeant Barham must also have known it to be untrue, for he was himself present at various of the examinations of Bannister.[2]

It was in vain that the duke required the witnesses themselves to be produced instead of their written depositions, of which only those portions were read which told against him. He was informed by the judges that the practice of examining witnesses in presence of the accused, although allowed in former times, had been found "too hard and dangerous for the prince." Norfolk was thus called upon to answer on the spot long written statements, which he heard

[1] See Murdin, 134.

[2] See Murdin, 143-146. The Attorney of the Wards (Wilbraham) also said in the course of his speech, "The confessions have been made by the parties freely, without torture or constraint."

for the first time, without an opportunity of putting a single question to those who made them, and without the privilege of calling a witness in reply. At one point he protested so loudly against this mockery of justice, that Lord Burghley seems to have considered himself bound in decency to interpose, by inquiring whether the duke had ever applied for leave to summon witnesses and collect proofs for his defence. Norfolk replied that he had many times made this request; whereupon Cecil drily remarked that he had not heard that any such application had been made to her majesty. Yet we cannot doubt that if such an application had been made, he must have been aware of it.

In order to prove the engagement between the Queen of Scots and the duke, there was read the letter of the Regent Murray to Elizabeth, in which he treacherously disclosed the import of the confidential interview which had taken place between him and Norfolk at Hampton Court.[1] That interview, it will be remembered, had not only been sought by Murray himself, but he had sought it with the professed object of reviving the scheme of his sister's marriage with the duke, although we know that in reality the regent was determinedly opposed to it.

After this letter had been read and duly commented upon by the queen's serjeant, the duke exclaimed, "The Earl of Murray sought my life; the others are not of credit. Yet," he truly added, "all these prove not that I dealt in the matter of the marriage with the Scottish queen in any respect of her claim to the crown of England. If the Bishop of Ross or any

[1] See *ante*, vol. i. 480, as to Murray's real object in seeking an interview with the duke.

other can say otherwise, let them be brought before me face to face."

Of the letters of the Queen of Scots to the duke, which had been preserved in so suspicious a manner by Higford, only one was produced. It may therefore be assumed that none of the others contained matter implicating either her or the accused. Nor did the letter in question prove anything, except that Mary regarded herself as the affianced wife of Norfolk, and that she was deeply interested in the fate of the Earl of Northumberland, who she well knew was in extreme peril at the time. The letter of Queen Mary was as follows:—

"I have received, my own good constant lord, your comfortable writings, which are to me as welcome as ever thing was, for the hope I see you are in to have some better fortune nor you had yet through all your friends' favour. And albeit my friend's case in Scotland be of heavy displeasure unto me, yet that was nothing to the fear I had of my son's delivery, and what I thought might be the cause of longer delaying your affairs; and therefore I took greater displeasure than I have done since, which diminisheth my health a little. The Earl of Shrewsbury came one night so merry to me,[1] showing that the Earl of Northumberland was rendered to the Earl of Sussex, which since I have found false. But at the sudden I took such fear for friends cumbering me, that I wept so that I was all swollen three days after; but since I have heard from you, I have gone abroad and sought

[1] It appears from this, and other instances, that Shrewsbury was ever on the alert to communicate any piece of unwelcome intelligence to his prisoner.

all means to avoid displeasure for fear of yours. I have no longer leisure, but I trust to write by one of my gentlemen shortly more surely. But I fear at Chatsworth I will get little means to hear from you or to write; but I shall do diligence: and in this mean time I write to the Bishop of Ross to hear your opinion in the usage of the ambassadors to have their master's help, and to follow it; for come what will, I shall never change from you, but during life be true and obedient, as I have professed. And so I pray you think and hold me in your grace as your own, who daily shall pray to God to send you happy and hasty deliverance of all troubles, not doubting but you would not then enjoy alone all your felicities, without remembering your own faithful to death, who shall not have any advancement or rest without you. And so I leave to trouble you, but commend you to God. At Tutbury, the 17th day of May 1570. Your own M."[1]

On this letter being read, the duke truly said that "it touched him not;" and we cannot but feel surprise that the Crown lawyers should have bestowed so much labour on this part of the case when they had evidence against the duke of a much more serious kind. But we believe that their conduct may be explained. On the first discovery of the engagement between Mary and Norfolk two years before, Elizabeth had been so transported with rage that she determined to charge the duke with high treason. But Cecil dissuaded her from

[1] This letter is not printed in Howell's State Trials. It is to be found in the Harleian MSS., No. 290, and Hardwick's State Papers, i. 192. As Mary never wrote in English at this time it must have been a translation, and in the absence of the original we have no means of knowing whether it is a correct one.

a step which he considered alike unwise and dangerous. He informed her that in his opinion the offence of Norfolk did not amount to treason; that if he was charged with that crime he would most probably be acquitted, and that his acquittal would only increase his power and popularity.[1] Elizabeth's fears finally prevailed over her love of vengeance, and the matter was allowed to drop. But the discovery of the Ridolphi plot renewed all her animosity against the duke, and all her jealousy of her rival; and we may probably conclude that it was she who insisted that the projected marriage should in itself be charged as treason. Although Lord Burghley deemed it insufficient, it might at least be the means of deterring other of her subjects from aspiring to so dangerous an alliance. If this object was attained, the Crown lawyers would not have exercised their ingenuity in vain.

The true offence of the duke in the eyes of the Council was his complicity in the Ridolphi plot. This part of the case was opened by the Attorney-General (Gerard), who had a much easier task to perform than the queen's sergeant. Upon this charge there was no necessity for putting any strained construction on the

[1] Cecil's letter to the queen is dated the 6th October 1569, and contains the following sensible advice: "If the duke shall be charged with the crime of treason, and shall not be thereof convicted, we shall not only save but increase his credit. And surely, without his facts may appear within the compass of treason (which I cannot see how they can), he shall be acquitted of that charge; and better it were in the beginning to foresee the matter than to attempt it with discredit, and not without suspicion of evil-will and malice. Wherefore I am bold to wish that your majesty would show your intention only to inquire of the fact and circumstances, and not by any speech to vote the same as treason. And if your majesty would yourself consider the words of the statute evidencing treason, I think you would so consider of it." He then cites the words of the Statute of Treasons, *ante*, 102.—Caligula, c. i. 331.

statute, for if Norfolk had invited a foreign Power to aid him in the overthrow of the queen's Government, he had certainly committed treason. But although we may entertain no moral doubt of his guilt, no proof that would be received at the present day was produced against him. The strongest piece of evidence as to this part of the charge was a letter of the Queen of Scots to the Bishop of Ross, which the latter had sent to the duke, and which had no doubt been found among those given up by Higford. After stating that she had determined to throw herself on the protection of Philip, she expressed herself as follows: "And therefore I would be of advice to send some faithful man towards the King of Spain, whom we might trust to make him understand the state of my realm; and also of the friends I have here, their deliberations, and the means they may have to set themselves to the fields, and *saist*[1] them of me, if the said King of Spain will sustain and embrace my cause and theirs. I think Rodolphi may best acquit himself of this charge securely of any that I know, under colour of his own traffic. And being known as he is, the King of Spain and the Pope will give him ear, and credit what shall be proposed by him to them. And also from his intelligence of the affairs of this country and of my realm, and by the instructions that he shall take from the Duke of Norfolk and of his friends, he may answer to the objections that shall be made to him. He sent me a memorandum by the which he describes several personages such as he thinketh are required, unnaming any man. As for my part, I

[1] The meaning seems to be to "possess themselves of," from the French "se saisir de."

know not of whom to make election of nor it be of him. The fear that they have on yonder side that the Duke of Norfolk will remain Protestant stays and holdeth all things in suspense. It shall be practised here to take away wholly the said suspicion, and to accommodate the whole to the satisfaction and contentment of the King of Spain and the Pope. I see no other means but to assure them of the duke, for that is the secret of the matter. My whole hope is in the Catholics of this realm. The negotiation must be holden very secret, and that Rodolphi keep himself well, that he makes no semblance thereof in France,[1] nor yet seem to meddle in any wise in my affairs. The season requires diligence and celerity; and therefore *if the Duke of Norfolk thinks the voyage of the said Rodolphi good,* I am of advice it be rather sooner than later, and well to tyne [2] no more time. I remit to the duke's wisdom to despatch and make him depart when he thinketh good."

When this letter was read, the duke made an implied admission that he had received it by asserting that he had sent word to the Scottish queen that "he misliked all such schemes," and recommended her instead to place her sole trust in the Queen of England. That he could in no way be held responsible for the contents of a letter addressed, not to him, but to a third person, is obvious. But taken in connection with subsequent events, this document materially affects the question of his innocence or guilt. It

[1] Ridolphi's mission was concealed from the French Government, obviously on account of the friendly footing at this time existing between Elizabeth and Catherine de Medici with reference to the Anjou marriage.

[2] Lose.

appears from it that Mary only accepted the proffered services of Ridolphi subject to the approval of the duke, by whose advice, we know, that she had acted implicitly for upwards of two years. To the duke she finally left the arrangement of all details; and that Ridolphi went abroad without his sanction we cannot believe. But Norfolk relied on the absence of positive proof. Of the instructions which Ridolphi carried with him to the Duke of Alva, the Crown lawyers had not recovered even a copy, and it was admitted that the original had not been signed by Norfolk. But there were read portions of the examinations of the Bishop of Ross and of Barker, professing to repeat conversations with Ridolphi, who had informed them of the result of his interview with Norfolk. If we believe this very doubtful kind of evidence, he had not only approved of the plot, but had informed Ridolphi of the precise number of auxiliaries that he required. They were to consist of at least ten thousand troops, including from three to four thousand horsemen, and they were to disembark at Harwich. At this point the duke made the following pertinent remarks: "It is said that there are two or three witnesses against me; but there is in fact but one witness, for Ridolphi said it to the Bishop of Ross, and the Bishop of Ross told it to Barker, and so from mouth to mouth; they are all but one witness. Mark, I pray you, the advices, and see how likely they are: ten thousand men must be landed, whereof three or four thousand must be horsemen; they must land at Harwich, a part of my county. But, in the first place, Harwich is not in my county, and Essex is the county in all England least proper to begin such an enterprise. There is no

county in England more replenished with Protestants than Essex and Suffolk, and none more likely to oppose Papists who came to destroy their religion. Besides, who would land horsemen in Essex, a county all full of lanes, woods, ditches, and marshes? I am not of such little skill in these things that I would not rather have chosen some other county if I had been so minded. Again, is it likely that I would have brought in a foreign Power, or joined with them to the overthrow of religion? These witnesses themselves admit that I could not be recovered from my religion, I would not be changed from my religion. I had rather be torn with wild horses."[1]

This professed attachment of the duke to his religion may have been sincere; but if so, the Catholic Powers were strangely misinformed, for we may conclude that they would never have listened to Ridolphi's scheme if they had not believed that Norfolk was ready to renounce his Protestantism. That he gave no pledge to any one upon the subject is probable; but that his whole conduct convinced the Bishop of Ross, the Spanish ambassador, and Ridolphi, that he was a Catholic at heart, we cannot doubt. Nor can his strict adherence to Protestantism during the remainder of his life remove the impression that in this as in other matters he acted a disingenuous part. The letter from the Queen of Scots found in his possession expressly referred to the doubts entertained abroad respecting his religion; and if he had been honest and sincere in his belief, he must have at once declared it. His silence may probably convince us that he was ready to be guided by circumstances,

[1] State Trials, vol. i.

and that however strong were his religious convictions, his ambition was stronger still.

The only witnesses examined throughout the trial were Richard Cavendish, a step-son of the Earl of Shrewsbury, who swore that he had heard Norfolk, speaking of the Queen of Scots, declare that "before he lost that marriag ehe would lose his life;" and various members of the Council, who swore that Barker, the duke's secretary, had made all his confessions "freely and without compulsion." Dr Wilson, the Master of the Court of Requests, was also called to speak to this point, and swore that "Barker was never offered torture, nor was once in the prison where the rack was."[1]

We have seen that the Crown lawyers had been instructed to inform the peers that none of the witnesses had been tortured, and we have no evidence that Barker was actually placed upon the rack. But

[1] "Of the credit due to Dr Wilson's testimony," says Mr Jardine, "the reader will be able to form a proper estimate by referring to Murdin's State Papers, p. 101, where will be found a joint letter from him and Sir Thomas Smith to Lord Burghley, dated 20th September 1571, in which they say, 'Of Bannister with the rack, of Barker *with the extreme fear of it*, we suppose we have gotten all.'" And that this mode of enforcing Barker's confession was adopted in consequence of the express command of the queen, appears from a letter from Burghley to Sir T. Smith, dated 9th September 1571, in which the former says, "Her majesty will have you use some extremity with Barker if he will not confess more truth," &c.—Cotton MSS., Caligula, c. iii. 254; Jardine's Criminal Trials, i. 194. It is this same Dr Wilson, the translator of Buchanan's 'Detection,' who asserts that Mary murdered her first husband in France, as well as her second husband in Scotland, and that she brought her third husband (Bothwell) to Carberry Hill with the intention of having him murdered also. And all these astounding facts, he says, he learned from no less a person than Mary's most zealous advocate, the Bishop of Ross. But as we know that Wilson was given to lying, it is much more probable that he invented these ridiculous tales than that the bishop should have proved himself to be both a liar and a fool. See Murdin, p. 57.

the statement made respecting him by the members of the Council could only have been made with the intention of misleading the peers as to the true state of the case. We know that both Bailly and Bannister were tortured, and that Barker and the Bishop of Ross were both threatened with torture in case they refused to speak. Burghley's colleagues spoke only as to Barker; but in no sense could it be said that he had "spoken freely and without compulsion" when, according to Wilson, he had been put in "extreme fear" before his testimony was taken down.

Before the conclusion of the case a statement of a most extraordinary kind was made by the Solicitor-General Bromley. He informed the peers that he had it in charge "from the queen's own mouth to state to them that a servant of a foreign ambassador in Flanders had made a full disclosure of the plot to the Council; but because it was improper, for reasons of State, to make the matter public, her Majesty desired that such of the lords as were members of the Council should impart it privately to their brother peers." The very name of the man who had supplied this mysterious piece of information was withheld from the accused; and, what is still more remarkable, he did not even venture to protest against so gross a violation of the first principles of justice. Under all the circumstances there could be little doubt as to the result of the trial, yet the peers remained in deliberation for upwards of an hour. When they had once more resumed their seats, they pronounced, but not in the hearing of the prisoner,[1] a unanimous

[1] This appears, from the report of the trial in the Lansdown MSS. No. 775, as follows: "After an hour and a quarter, which was immedi-

verdict of guilty. Sentence of death was then passed in due form by the Lord High Steward. The duke heard it with the same composure which he had displayed throughout the day. He solemnly declared that he had been condemned upon false testimony, and that he was, and ever had been, a true man to God and to the queen.

During the absence of the Earl of Shrewsbury in London, Sir Ralph Sadler had been sent to Sheffield to act in his place as keeper of the Scottish queen. On his return to Court, Elizabeth was curious to learn from Sadler all particulars respecting her prisoner; and the report of the veteran statesman was so favourable, that his mistress peevishly observed there seemed to be something incomprehensible about this Queen of Scots, who could thus compel her very enemies to speak well of her.[1] It was in consequence,

ately after eight of the clock at night, the lords came again upon the scaffold, and took their places as they were before. And then the Lord Steward, having ordered the duke to be taken further out of hearing, demanded of every one of them severally, sitting in their places, beginning with the youngest baron," &c. Speaking of the Duke of Norfolk's trial, Hume remarks: "The trial was quite regular, even according to the strict rules observed at present in these matters, except that the witnesses gave not their evidence in court, and were not confronted with the prisoner," &c.—Hist., c. xl. This is a singular mistake. Not only were the most material witnesses against him not produced, but he was denied the privilege of calling witnesses in his defence; he was denied all legal assistance, and every kind of hearsay evidence was admitted against him. In Hume's day, trials for high treason were conducted very differently, as may be seen from the proceedings against the Lords Kilmarnock, Balmerino, and Lovat, for their share in the rebellion of 1745. All these noblemen had ample notice of the charge that was to be made against them; they were allowed to select their own counsel, and to call any witnesses they chose in their defence.—See Howell, vol. xviii.

[1] "Que cella estoit de devin en la parolle et en la presence de la dicte royne d'Escosse, que l'ung et l'autre contraignaient ses propres ennemys de dire bien d'elle."—Fénelon, iv. 391.

apparently, of Sadler's report, that some relaxation was now made in the treatment of the unhappy captive. On his return to Sheffield, Shrewsbury allowed her to take exercise outside the walls of her prison, within which she had been constantly confined for upwards of five months. Even in the bleak month of February she hailed this privilege with delight; and we learn from Shrewsbury that, on the first occasion on which she walked abroad, she could not refrain, in the ecstasy of her newly-recovered liberty, from plunging up to the ankles in the snow.[1]

The conviction of the Duke of Norfolk by a unanimous verdict of his peers, was a signal triumph for Lord Burghley. But his work was only as yet half done. Elizabeth had been quite as eager as her minister to crush this great noble; but now that he was at her mercy, she refused, with characteristic inconstancy, to carry out the sentence of the law. Twice she signed the warrant for his execution, and twice, in spite of Burghley's utmost efforts, she cancelled it.[2] She had shown no such reluctance to shed the blood of the northern rebels in 1569. But Norfolk was her kinsman, as well as the first noble in the realm; her declared unwillingness to shed his blood was believed to be genuine, and the courtiers predicted that his life would be spared, in spite of all the efforts of his enemies.[3]

The pulpit in the sixteenth century was generally at

[1] Mr Froude regards this very natural incident as clearly indicative of the dangerous character of the Scottish queen: "Untamed and intractable as the eagle of her native mountains," &c.; vol. x. 337.

[2] See her letter to Burghley; Ellis, ii. 263.

[3] Digges, 203. Burghley was believed to be the chief of Norfolk's enemies. Sir W. Raleigh, writing to Sir Robert Cecil in 1601, says, "Your own father was esteemed to be the contriver of Norfolk's ruin." —Murdin, 811.

the service of the ruling powers; and the sermons of the divines abounded, at this time, with denunciations of the Duke of Norfolk. The Bishop of Lincoln, while preaching before the queen, even took occasion to remind her that there was often mercy in punishing and cruelty in sparing.[1] But as Elizabeth still remained irresolute, her ministers induced her—under the pretext of public business, but in reality to furnish them with the means of overcoming her scruples—to summon a Parliament.

The two Houses met on the 8th of May, and in their addresses to the queen they earnestly entreated her to consent to the execution of Norfolk. By this means, as well as by the continuous efforts of her ministers, her repugnance, real or feigned, to send him to the scaffold, was eventually overcome. She signed his death-warrant for the third time, and on the 2d of June the sentence of the law was at length carried into effect. He exhibited, during his last moments, the same calm and dignified demeanour which had been conspicuous on his trial. He declared that he was innocent of treason, and that he had ever been a true member of the Reformed religion. Norfolk was

[1] "I fear that the Bishop of Lincoln's words in his sermon before her majesty will prove true, alleged out of Augustine, that there was *misera-cordia puniens, crudelitas parcens*," &c.—Randolph to the Bishop of Durham; Wright, i. 416. That Burghley was in the habit of giving directions to the clergy regarding their treatment of political topics, appears from a letter addressed to him, in the course of this year, by the Bishop of London. He says: "The citizens of London, in these dangerous days, had need prudently to be dealt withal; the preachers appointed for the Cross (Saint Paul's) in this vacation are but young men, unskilful in matters political. . . . If I may receive from your lordship some direction or advice herein, I will not fail to direct them so well as I can."—The Bishop of London to Lord Burghley, 5th Sept. 1572; Wright, i. 438.

only thirty-six years old; and his fate excited the deepest commiseration among the people, by whom he was universally beloved,[1] and who well remembered that his father, the gallant and accomplished Surrey, had, twenty-five years before, perished on the same spot by the hands of the common executioner.

The sacrifice of Norfolk was only intended as a prelude to that of a more illustrious victim. The puritanical element was strongly represented at this time in the House of Commons, and the Scottish queen furnished the chief topic of discussion during the remainder of the session. Due care had been taken to inflame the minds of members by circulating Buchanan's libel, and other writings of a similar character, composed apparently by divines, and intended to prove that Mary might be lawfully put to death either as a public enemy or as an idolatress. No precedent could be found in law, or even in profane history, for such an act; but the enemies of Mary triumphantly referred to the Old Testament for abundant authorities to justify her execution. In an elaborate address to the queen the Commons reminded her that, "when God by His just providence doth commit any grievous offender into the hands of a prince or magistrate as to his minister to be punished, he ought to fear the heavy displeasure of God if by any colour he do omit the same."[2] They reminded her that, be-

[1] He made a long speech when on the scaffold, in the course of which he was frequently interrupted by the sheriff, apparently on account of the sympathy manifested by the spectators. When he knelt down at the block he would not allow the executioner to bandage his eyes, but "bid him not to fear, as he would lie quietly and handsomely."—Record Office, Domestic.

[2] D'Ewes, Journal, 208.

cause Saul spared Agag, God transferred the kingdom of Israel from Saul and his heirs for ever. They reminded her how different had been the conduct of Joshua, "a worthy prince and governor, who put to death at one time *five kings*, and that as might appear rudely, causing his soldiers to set their feet on their necks and slay them." They further referred to the fate of two wicked queens, Jezabel and Athaliah, both inferior in wickedness to the Queen of Scots, who were "by God's magistrates executed, and the same execution commended in Scripture."[1]

But the great and unpardonable crime of the Scottish queen was her religion. "Shall we think," they asked, "that the gathering of a few sticks on the Sabbath-day is to be punished by death in a poor, simple person, and the seeking to subvert the Gospel of Christ, and to draw the people of God to that idolatrous doctrine that teacheth to impute the merit of Christ's blood and passion to wicked men's devices, yea, to stocks, to stones, to sticks, to water, to bells, shall not be worthy the punishment of death in a noble person? God direct our judgment otherways."[2]

These arguments satisfied both Lords and Commons; but they did not satisfy Elizabeth, who peremptorily rejected a bill of attainder against the Queen of Scots, which had passed both Houses apparently without a dissenting voice.

Baffled in their attempts against her life, Burghley and his friends changed their tactics. They introduced a bill which, by setting aside her claim to the succession, was intended to secure them from her resentment in case she should survive her rival. But

[1] D'Ewes, 212. [2] Ibid., 212.

Elizabeth, acting, it was suspected, under the influence of Leicester, refused her assent even to this comparatively moderate measure.[1] The determination displayed by Elizabeth in thus frustrating the various schemes of vengeance proposed by her ministers was, under all the circumstances, very remarkable; nor can we account for her conduct, unless she was profoundly conscious that her treatment of the Scottish queen was wholly indefensible, and that any additional measures of severity might justly provoke the active intervention of the Catholic Powers.

Why Leicester should have interfered at this time in Mary's behalf is not so easy to explain; and we may observe generally that there is no politician of the age whose real designs it is so difficult to fathom as those of Elizabeth's chief favourite. Nothing can be more intelligible and consistent than the policy of Burghley; and the same may be said of that of his principal adherents. Although we are frequently disposed to condemn the means by which they sought to accomplish their purposes, it cannot be denied that, in the main, they were true to Elizabeth and to the cause of the Reformation. But the conduct of Leicester to the Queen of Scots, from first to last, can only be explained by the utter insincerity and faithlessness of the man. He had been a suitor for her hand, when he was in reality aspiring to that of Elizabeth. He

[1] Writing to Walsingham in July, Burghley says: "Now for our Parliament I cannot write patiently; all that we laboured for and had with full consent brought to fashion—I mean a law to make the Scottish queen unable and unworthy of succession of the crown—was by her Majesty neither assented to nor rejected, but deferred until the feast of All Saints. Some here have, as it seemeth, abused their favour about her Majesty to make herself her worst enemy. God amend them," &c.—Digges, 219.

had been apprised of the plan for the murder of Riccio,[1] as well as of the ulterior designs of the assassins against the liberty, if not the life, of the woman for whom he had so shortly before professed unbounded affection, and he had signified his approval of the plot by his silence. He had subsequently taken the most active part among the English nobility in promoting her marriage with the Duke of Norfolk; but finding that Elizabeth was resolutely opposed to the match, he had taken an equally active part in bringing that unfortunate nobleman to the block. Why he should now alone among the Protestant leaders have desired to spare the Queen of Scots, seems to admit of only one explanation. He had probably by this time given up all hopes of Elizabeth; but now that Norfolk was gone, he might still obtain her consent to a marriage with the Scottish queen. Although he could no longer hope to be the consort of his sovereign, he might yet be the consort of her successor. The match had originally been proposed by his mistress; and she might, in process of time, become reconciled to it as the best means of settling the succession, as well as of preventing her rival, or her son, forming an alliance with one or other of the Catholic Powers. That Mary suspected Leicester of these designs is certain; but it is no less certain that she regarded with unmixed abhorrence the prospect of a marriage with the grandson of a usurer and the reputed murderer of his wife.[2]

Although Elizabeth was not yet prepared to take the life of her guest, or even to exclude her from the succession, she was perfectly willing to adopt any

[1] See the letter of Randolph; *ante*, vol. i. 133.

[2] See her letter to her uncle the Cardinal of Lorraine; Labanoff, iv. 206.

step that was calculated to humiliate and annoy her. With this sole object, for she clearly had no other, commissioners were appointed to proceed to Sheffield with a catalogue of grievances, both old and new, against the captive queen. Lord de la Warr, Sir Ralph Sadler, the Solicitor-General Bromley, and Dr Wilson, the translator of Buchanan, were the persons chosen for the mission, and they arrived at Sheffield on the 16th of June. They found Mary in deep distress,[1] on account of the death of Norfolk, respecting whose fate she had been kept in painful suspense ever since his trial. But although suffering both in mind and body, she received Elizabeth's commissioners with her accustomed self-possession, and listened patiently to the complaints — thirteen in number — which they had been instructed to make against her. The first was the charge, repeated for the twentieth time, that she had worn the arms of England. The commissioners further complained that she had sought to marry the Duke of Norfolk without the consent of the queen, and even, in defiance of her prohibition, to bring about the marriage by force; that she had stirred up a rebellion in the northern counties, and caused aid to be given to the rebel subjects of the Queen of England both in Scotland and in Flanders; that she had commissioned Ridolphi to invite the King of Spain to invade the realm; that she had conspired with various of her Majesty's subjects to obtain her liberty, with the purpose of laying claim to the crown; that she was in constant correspondence with the Pope, and had induced him to publish a bull against her Majesty; and

[1] See Sadler's letter in Ellis, second series.

that many of her friends abroad had asserted openly that she was the rightful Queen of England.[1]

To these charges Mary, on the following day, returned a written reply—protesting, at the same time, that, being an independent sovereign, she was induced to answer only in respect of the near relationship between her and the Queen of England, whose friendship she had ever sincerely desired. With respect to the first complaint of the commissioners—the wearing of the arms of England—she said that she could not in reason be held accountable, as she was at the time not only in her minority, but married to a foreign prince, and that subsequent to his death it was well known she had never worn them; that it was true she had consented to a marriage with the Duke of Norfolk, believing it to be for the advantage of both realms, but that she had never at any time intended or desired to bring it about by force; that she had neither instigated nor approved of the northern rebellion, nor had she in any way assisted the English rebels, except by recommending the Countess of Northumberland to the Duke of Alva; that it was true she had applied to the Kings of France and Spain, to the Pope, and to other princes, to aid her in recovering her liberty, and she was quite prepared, whenever an opportunity were afforded her, to justify her conduct in this respect before the Parliament of England; that she well knew Ridolphi was an agent of the Papal Court, and that she had employed him to raise money on her account, but that she had received no letter from him since he quitted England; that, being unjustly detained a prisoner, she had always readily listened to any one

[1] Murdin, 218.

who undertook to restore her to liberty, and she had supplied Rolleston[1] and Hall, at their request, with an alphabet in cipher, but she had never of herself devised any method of escape; that she utterly denied having procured or approved of the Papal bull issued against Queen Elizabeth, a copy of which she had read and immediately thereafter committed to the flames; finally, she declared that if her friends and adherents beyond the seas had ever asserted that she was the rightful Queen of England, they had done so entirely without her knowledge or approval.

Considering that she was acting at this time entirely without advice, no one will deny the ability, and even the forensic skill, with which Mary defended herself against the charges of Elizabeth's commissioners. It is to be observed that she evaded the most serious point urged against her—namely, that she had invited the King of Spain to invade the realm. But the broad question for the decision of posterity is not whether she was justified in returning an evasive answer to Elizabeth's commissioners, but whether she was justified in authorising Ridolphi, which she unquestionably did, to seek at this time the active assistance of the Spanish king to relieve her from captivity. Upon this point there can be but one impartial opinion. When Richard I. was detained a prisoner in Germany, it is well known that he appealed for aid to the Pope as well as to other princes; and who has ever questioned his right to seek his deliverance by means of foreign aid? Yet the

[1] Labanoff, iv. 48; and Camden. Rolleston and Hall had both been engaged in the scheme to carry her off from Wingfield in the autumn of 1569; *ante*, p. 2, note.

detention of Richard was a much more justifiable act than the imprisonment of the Scottish queen. He was made a prisoner while travelling in disguise, and without a safe-conduct, through the dominions of a prince with whom he was on most unfriendly terms.[1] Mary was induced to come to England in consequence of the warm and repeated invitations of her sister queen; and her detention as a prisoner was a breach, not only of the law of nations, but of the still more sacred laws of hospitality.

Within three months of the execution of Norfolk, another distinguished partisan of the Queen of Scots perished on the scaffold. The Earl of Northumberland, from the time of Mary's arrival in England, had evinced an interest in her fortunes which caused him to be closely watched. He had sought and obtained an interview with her at Carlisle, and he was highly indignant with the Warden of the Western Marches[2] and his deputy because they refused to allow her to accompany him to Alnwick Castle. Northumberland was no politician. Like other of the great nobles in this reign, he lived much in the old feudal fashion among his vassals and retainers, and preferred the bracing air of his native wolds to the turmoil of courts

[1] The Duke of Austria.

[2] "Yesternight arrived the said earl (Northumberland); and I attending on him by the way, he declared that his repair (to Carlisle) was for the conducting of the same queen, which I said I might not depart from without very good authority; whereupon after he had used some rough words towards me, adding too that I was too mean a man to have such a charge, and that he marvelled how I durst take it in hand." Lowther added that after his interview with the Queen of Scots, the earl, "growing into some heat and anger, gave me great threatenings, with many evil words, calling me 'varlett,' and such others as I neither deserved at his hands, neither looked for at any man's."—Letter of Lowther to Lord Scrope, 22, 1568. See Sharpe, Memorials of the Rebellion; Appendix, 340.

and cities. Simple in his tastes, and a stranger to the arts of political intrigues, no man seemed less fitted by nature and habit to become the leader of a rebellion. But imbued with all the prejudices of his order, he regarded with dislike and jealousy the men who ruled the State; and these sentiments were deepened by the strength of his religious convictions. When, therefore, after the farce of the Westminster conference had been played out, the northern gentry resolved to strike a blow for the freedom of the Scottish queen and the restoration of the ancient faith, they naturally looked to the representative of the Percys, and his friend and neighbour Westmoreland, to be their leaders. Both noblemen, it appears, were at the first opposed to the scheme; but, as frequently happens on such occasions, their scruples were finally overcome by the zeal and daring of their more sanguine followers.[1]

Northumberland had now been upwards of two years a prisoner in Lochleven Castle. After his base betrayal to his enemies, his countess had fled to the Low Countries, where, with laudable devotion, she contrived to amass a sum of not less than two thousand pounds for the ransom of her husband. This amount she offered as the price of the earl's liberty. But the Regent Mar—or, to speak more accurately, his chief adviser Morton—deemed it more prudent to sell their prisoner to Elizabeth, provided she would pay a sum equal to that tendered by his wife. The business required secrecy, for we have seen that even in this ruthless age the giving up of a fugitive to certain death was regarded as a

[1] Sharpe's Memorials, Appendix, 207.

heinous crime. Of all the actors in this scene of infamy, Morton, in the opinion of his contemporaries, incurred the largest share of guilt; for when he fled to England a proscribed outlaw, he had been much indebted to the generosity of Northumberland, who doubtless remembered that in times past Douglas and Percy had been occasionally fast friends as well as mortal enemies. When apprised of the terms upon which alone the surrender of the great northern earl was to be obtained, Elizabeth chafed and stormed, as she ever did when demands were made upon her purse. The price demanded by these shameless Scots seemed unreasonably high; but she knew that they could obtain it from another purchaser if she declined the terms: and, weighed in the balance with her avarice, her love of vengeance finally prevailed. She agreed to pay the stipulated sum, no one being intrusted with the secret except her ministers and those who were to share the plunder. It was given out that Northumberland was to be conveyed in a Scotch ship to Antwerp; and the earl joyfully left his dreary prison and embarked on the Firth of Forth—as he believed, for the port where his wife and many of his friends were awaiting his arrival. But, to his disappointment and dismay, the vessel, instead of putting out to sea, ran down the coast of Berwickshire, and anchored off Coldingham. The earl had been committed to the care of John Colville,[1] a brother of the

[1] See Melville's Memoirs. John Colville had originally been a Presbyterian minister, but had been deposed for neglect of his duties. He then became a political adventurer; and we find that he was employed on various occasions both by the Government of Scotland and the English ministers. He finally renounced Protestantism, and died in great poverty in Paris. Mr David Laing is of opinion that the 'Historie

Laird of Cleish, who here exchanged him for the stipulated price. The money was paid in gold by Lord Hunsdon, who had been specially commissioned to complete the bargain, and who forthwith conveyed his prisoner to Berwick.

The demeanour of Northumberland, thus a victim for the second time of the vilest treachery, was very different from that of Norfolk in the presence of the Council. The earl desired to live, but he disdained to make any abject admissions or confessions to save his life. Hunsdon complains that he found him more ready to talk of "his hounds and his hawks, and such vain matters," than of aught else.[1] This was a serious disappointment to Burghley and his mistress, who seem to have concluded that, once in their power, the earl would disclose all he knew respecting the rebellion. Hunsdon was meanwhile desired to extract from his prisoner all the information he could; and the method he was to employ was very clearly pointed out in a letter addressed to him by Elizabeth herself: "In the dealing therein," she said, "you may use such speeches as may justly terrify him with all extremity of punishment if he shall conceal anything; and sometimes, as you see cause, you may also comfort him with some hope, *so as it be not in our name*, nor by us warranted, if he will utter the truth of every person, without regard to any, whatsoever they be, though he may think they be in place of credit."[2]

Hunsdon was thus to comfort the earl "with some hope;" or, in other words, to induce him to believe

of King James the Sext' was the work of John Colville. See Preface to letters of John Colville published by the Bannatyne Club, 1858.

[1] Sharpe, 330. [2] Sharpe, Memorials, 331.

that his life would be spared if he made a clean breast, and disclosed all he knew. These were the same kind of tactics which had been prescribed to Shrewsbury, only he was "to tempt the patience"[1] of the Scottish queen, and thus provoke her to criminate herself. Hunsdon, on the other hand, was desired to hold out to his prisoner false and utterly delusive hopes, with exactly the same object. It is satisfactory to know that in both instances these paltry devices failed to produce the effect desired.

Another portion of Elizabeth's instructions to her cousin was highly characteristic: "As for any chargeable entertainment of him in his diet, we like not, considering he is a person attainted; and by over-tender usage he may gather comfort to persist in denial of the truth of things to his knowledge."[2] Having paid what she no doubt considered an exorbitant sum for her prisoner, she would economise by putting him on short allowance; but it is probable that Hunsdon took upon himself to disregard the stingy orders of his cousin, for it is nowhere stated that the earl was starved.

In addition to the instructions thus privately sent to Hunsdon, a long series of questions was framed by Burghley, to each of which Northumberland was required to give a written answer. The object of these interrogatories was to ascertain who were the parties mainly responsible for the northern rebellion, and especially to prove the complicity of the Scottish queen. But upon this latter point Burghley was

[1] *Ante*, p. 68.

[2] Sharpe, ibid. If we might hazard a conjecture, we should say the first portion of the letter to Hunsdon was devised by Burghley, and the restrictions as to diet by the queen herself.

wholly disappointed; for Northumberland distinctly stated that, so far from approving of the insurrection, she had earnestly dissuaded them from embarking in that rash enterprise. As this answer was the reverse of that which Burghley had desired, he sent down to Berwick a fresh series of interrogatories, in the course of which he artfully suggested that she had advised them to postpone the rising only until she could obtain for them a sufficient sum of money. To this second query Northumberland replied no less distinctly: "She never required us to stay until she might obtain any aid of money, but required us generally not to rise."[1] To a similar question in the first series of interrogatories he had answered, "No aid was promised; nor I know not what moved her to advise us to stay than that which might move all wise men to see unto, as the sequel appeared."[2]

With regard to his own share in the rebellion, Northumberland made no attempt at concealment; but he generously sought to extenuate the guilt of his exiled friend and confederate Westmoreland, who, he alleged, had been most reluctant to join the insurgents, and had only been at last induced to take up arms by the tears and entreaties of his wife.[3] Nor-

[1] Sharpe, Memorials, 219.

[2] Ibid., 206. Irrespective of the reasons for Mary's disapproval thus stated by Northumberland, we know that at the time she was acting entirely by the advice of Norfolk, and we know that he was decidedly opposed to the rising of the northern lords.—See the evidences of Richard Cavendish on his trial; Howell, vol. i.

[3] She was a sister of the Duke of Norfolk, and a person of great spirit and accomplishments. She was also, like her brother, a Protestant—having been, like him, the pupil of Foxe the martyrologist. It is but just to add that she denied having instigated her husband to join the rebellion; and her statement was probably believed, as Elizabeth allowed her an annuity of £300 out of the confiscated estates of the

folk had been ready to cast blame upon any one to shield himself. The Regent Murray, the Bishop of Ross, his own secretaries and servants, were all, he asserted, plotting against his life. In his efforts to escape the punishment which was his due, he hardly spared the unhappy princess who had the misfortune to be his affianced wife. Northumberland accused no man of treachery or falsehood, nor did he blame any one except himself for the peril in which he stood.

The process of examination to which he was subjected lasted five or six weeks; and at its termination Lord Hunsdon received orders to convey his prisoner to York, where the queen had commanded that he should be executed as a traitor. As an act of attainder had been passed against him,[1] he could no longer claim the privilege of a trial by his peers.

What effect this intelligence had upon the unfortunate earl we are not informed, but upon Hunsdon it came like a thunderbolt. Although a rough soldier, he was by no means destitute of humanity; and he seems to have concluded from the delay that had elapsed, and the readiness with which his prisoner had answered all the questions put to him by the Council, that his life should be spared. Resolved, at all events, that he should not lead the earl to the shambles, he on the instant wrote a highly indignant letter to Lord Burghley, declaring that some one else must be found to perform that degrading duty, and that rather than

earl. On the 13th of June, Lord Hunsdon writes to Burghley that "the earl doth greatly excuse my Lord of Westmoreland, and saith plainly that he could never get any hold of him till the last hour, and that by procurement of his wife."—Sharpe, 330.

[1] In the Parliament of this year.

obey the order he was prepared to go to prison.[1] Three days later he wrote in a calmer strain, respectfully but strongly recommending the queen to spare the earl's life, "although by law he deserved to die."[2] But Elizabeth turned a deaf ear to her gallant cousin, and Burghley required another victim among the great nobility. As Hunsdon, however, at no inconsiderable risk to himself, positively refused to obey their orders, Sir John Foster, upon whom the queen had bestowed a large portion of the earl's estates, was appointed to convey him to York, where, on the 22d of August, without further process of any kind, he was led to the scaffold. To the last he declared himself to be a true member of the ancient faith; and as such he refused to pray for Elizabeth, whom he no doubt regarded as a heretic and a usurper.[3] Whether by accident or design, a common carpenter's axe was the weapon employed to sever his head from his body; and his high rank, the disgraceful circumstances attending his betrayal by the Scots, and his steadfast adherence to his religion, created a profound sensation throughout the north of England, and even in foreign countries.[4]

His confederate, the Earl of Westmoreland, was

[1] The letter of Hunsdon is printed in Sharpe, 331. He says that, when about to sit down to dinner, he received Burghley's letter, "whyche gave me my dyner," &c.

[2] Sharpe, 332.

[3] Ibid., 335.

[4] See Apuntamientos, 128. There is in the Cotton Library a contemporary English ballad on the fate of Northumberland, of which the following lines form a part:—

"I lothe to tell how now of lat
That cruel Scotland hath procurde
The slander of their realm and state
By promise broken most assurde
Which shamefull act from mynde of man
Shall not departe, do what they can.

hardly more fortunate. He survived the rebellion upwards of thirty years, a dependant on the bounty of strangers for his daily bread. A small pension was allowed him by the King of Spain, but it was irregularly paid; and he received occasional assistance, when it was in her power to give it, from the Queen of Scots.[1] The continued efforts of his wife to obtain a remission of his sentence of forfeiture proved unavailing, and the last male descendant of the great Earl of Warwick died at Brussels in poverty and debt in 1601.[2]

The noblest lord of Percie, kinde,
Of honour and possessions faire,
As God to him the place assigned,
To Scottishe grounde made his repaire;
Who, after promise manifolde,
Was last betrayed for English golde.

Who shall hereafter trust a Scott?
Or who will do that nation good
That so themselves do stayne and blott
In selling of such noble blood?
Let lordes of this a mirror make,
And in distresse that land forsake," &c.
—Printed in Wright, i. 432.

[1] In February 1576, she writes to her ambassador in Paris to pay to Westmoreland and two others four thousand francs, but to keep the matter secret, lest the Scots should be jealous.—See Sharpe, 302. In the following year, having heard that the earl complained of her neglect, she again writes to her ambassador on the 25th of March: "I esteem and honour his goodwill, and will not neglect whatever may be in my power; which let him understand from me, assisting him, if necessary, with two or three hundred crowns."—Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 304.

CHAPTER XIX.

EVENTS IN FRANCE AND IN SCOTLAND.

NOTWITHSTANDING the close captivity of Mary, and the death or dispersion of her principal adherents in England, her partisans in Scotland not only continued to hold their ground, but to acquire fresh confidence and strength. The loss of Dumbarton Castle in the spring of the previous year was more than balanced, in the estimation of the queen's friends, by the surprise of Stirling, which they universally regarded as a military success. Adam Gordon was still master of the country beyond the Tay; Lord Sempill had been defeated by Lord Claud Hamilton in the West;[1] Fernihirst had once more rallied his followers on the Border, where no one ventured to attack him;[2] and his father-in-law, Kirkaldy, still held the principal fortress in the kingdom, where he had received supplies of money and ammunition both from France and Spain. There seemed to be an inextinguishable vitality among the queen's adherents; for no sooner were they suppressed in one quarter than they sprang up in another, more numerous and formidable than ever. Elizabeth and her ministers had hoped that the destructive expeditions of Sussex,

[1] Historie of King James the Sext, 176. [2] Ibid., 177.

Scrope, and Drury would firmly establish the regent's authority; but they only inflicted a vast amount of individual misery without permanently affecting the resources of the rival factions. To send a fresh expedition into Scotland, when the queen's friends were everywhere so confident, was an experiment too hazardous to be attempted; but another expedient might be tried, which, on a former occasion, had proved eminently successful. After the termination of the Westminster conference, Mary's adherents, though far more numerous and powerful than their opponents, had been induced to suspend hostilities by the artifices of the Regent Murray.[1] The same device might be tried again, and with the like results. Terms of pacification might be proposed to the contending parties; and as the country had suffered frightfully from the effects of the civil war, Elizabeth had a plausible pretext for offering to mediate between them. A correspondence was accordingly commenced between Lord Burghley and Maitland;[2] and it is surprising that the latter, who knew so well the parties with whom he had to deal, should have failed to perceive their true object in seeking to bring about an armistice. Ostensibly it was the unprecedented misery of the country which prompted them to interfere; in reality they sought to save the regent's faction, which at this time stood in imminent danger of irretrievable defeat.

But Maitland and Kirkaldy had been long denounced by the regent's supporters, and more especially by the clergy, as the wicked authors and promoters of the war. Anxious to relieve themselves from reproaches which

[1] See vol. i. 483.

[2] Maitland to Burghley, 26th Oct. 1571; Record Office.

they could certainly apply with equal justice to their opponents, they listened to the terms proposed, and, in an evil hour for their mistress and themselves, consented to a suspension of hostilities. An agreement to that effect was signed on the 30th of July;[1] and it was stipulated that, as soon as practicable, the Estates of the kingdom should be convened, to discuss and determine the conditions of a general peace.[2]

But before the Parliament could be assembled, events had taken place in France which materially affected the course of British politics, and more especially the prospects of the Scottish queen.

From the date of the treaty of St Germains, the influence of the Huguenots had been steadily increasing; and in the summer of 1572, the queen-mother was projecting for her family no less than two Protestant alliances. She had not yet given up hopes of marrying one of her sons to the Queen of England; and she had promised her daughter Margaret to young Henry of Navarre. Another circumstance, which was considered of immense importance by the Protestants throughout Europe, was the conclusion of a treaty, offensive and defensive, between Charles IX. and Elizabeth, which was signed at Blois on the 11th of April of this year.[3] Jealousy of Spain[4] was undoubtedly the motive for this decided change of policy on the part of France; and this sentiment was

[1] July 30, 1572. See the terms; History of King James the Sext, 179.
[2] Tytler, vii. 307. [3] Camden; Dumont, corps diplomatique.
[4] Writing to Leicester from Paris, shortly after the battle of Lepanto, Walsingham says: "Whatsoever show the king here giveth of joy outwardly, he doth not best like of the victory, as that thing which addeth too great an increase of reputation to the King of Spain."—Walsingham to Leicester, 7th Nov. 1571; Digges, 150.

in no degree diminished by the brilliant exploits of Don John of Austria in the Levant. Under circumstances thus promising for the cause he had embraced, Count Louis of Nassau, the gallant brother of the Prince of Orange, repaired to Paris. He was received with much cordiality by Coligni, and even by the young king, to whom he pointed out the obvious danger of allowing Spain to establish a permanent military despotism in the Netherlands. His arguments proved so successful, that he obtained for his struggling countrymen a considerable body of troops, with which he advanced rapidly upon Mons, and captured that important city.[1] Before he quitted Paris it had been secretly stipulated, with the concurrence of the king, that Coligni should follow Count Louis as speedily as possible with an army of 15,000 men, and that together they should form a junction with the Prince of Orange, who was at this time at the head of a still larger force.[2] By one combined and decisive effort the Duke of Alva might then be crushed, and the independence of the Netherlands secured.

To all appearance Protestantism had at length gained the ascendancy in France. Charles had certainly sanctioned the expedition which resulted in the capture of Mons,[3] and the chief of the Huguenots was about to lead a French army against the Spanish forces in the Netherlands. The Calvinist Queen of Navarre, Jean d'Albret, was a guest at the Louvre; nor did her death, which occurred unexpectedly[4] in the month

[1] Bentivoglio, lib. vi. 100. Mons was taken on 25th May.

[2] Correspondence de Philippe, ii. 1146.

[3] Massacre of St Bartholomew, by Henry White; edit. 1868.

[4] Davila, like Dante, fond of exaggerating the crimes of his countrymen, says that her death was caused by a pair of poisoned gloves which

of June, prevent the marriage of her son with Margaret of Valois, which was celebrated on the 18th of August with extraordinary splendour. The match, it was true, was a purely political one; for Margaret, whose beauty is said to have rivalled, and in the eyes of her admirers eclipsed, that of her Scottish sister-in-law, had fixed her affections on the young Duke of Guise,[1] at that time accounted the most accomplished cavalier in France. But on the surface all was smooth and brilliant; and the union of a daughter of the Medici with the son of a Protestant queen gave promise, after twelve years of mortal strife, of a happy and final concord between the rival faiths. Yet within a week the calculations of the most astute politicians in Europe were scattered to the winds by one of those unlooked-for incidents which have so often in the world's history entirely changed the current of events.

The tragedy of Bartholomew, like many of the worst of national crimes, was the result, not of premeditation, but of panic.[2] To the guilty terrors of Catherine, and not to the perfidy of her unhappy son, we must look for the true cause of the catastrophe. It is incredible that Charles should have mortally offended the Pope and

she was induced to wear.—Lib. v. But it appears that she died of a disease of the lungs of long standing.—See Soldan Protestantismus in Frankreich, b. ii. 428, and the authorities there cited.

[1] Davila, lib. v.

[2] Various Italian writers, imbued with the Machiavellian notions of the age, take credit to Catherine and her son for the refinement of perfidy with which they planned and executed the massacre.—See Capilupi, lo Stratagemma di Carlo IX., contra gli Ugonotti: Adriani, lib. xxii. 49; and Davila, lib. v. By these writers the historians of the last century, Hume, Robertson, and others, appear to have been misled. But there is an overwhelming preponderance of modern authorities on the other side.

the Catholic Powers by sending an army to assist the Protestant insurgents in the Netherlands for the mere purpose of deceiving Coligni. It is certain, moreover, that he took this hazardous step without the concurrence, and probably without the knowledge, of his mother. There is abundant evidence to show that he entertained at this time an anxious desire to conciliate the Huguenots, and bring about a lasting peace. Although his education had been shamefully neglected by the worst of mothers, Charles was by no means destitute of generous feelings; and we have every reason to believe not only that the affectionate deference which he paid to Coligni was sincere, but that the influence which the Protestant chief had imperceptibly acquired over the mind of the young king at this time was the true cause of the massacre. A bigot though he was in his religion, there was about Coligni a certain noble simplicity and singleness of purpose, which from the first seems to have captivated the impressionable Charles. He could not fail to contrast his new favourite with the swarm of parasites and panders by whom he had been surrounded from his childhood. But this intimacy, so auspiciously begun, and so creditable both to Coligni and the king, was regarded with intense dislike and jealousy by the queen-mother. Until the Protestant chief appeared at Court she had exercised unbounded sway over her wayward son; but she was now confronted by a rival who grew more and more formidable every day. By his persuasion Charles, unknown to her, had consented to a war with Spain. It was agreed that the secret should be kept from Catherine; but she was not easily deceived. Although she failed, even with the aid of her female spies, to discover

the subject of the frequent consultations between her son and the admiral, she saw very clearly that she was no longer mistress of France. She had held the reins ever since the murder of the Duke of Guise; it must have now occurred to her that another murder was necessary to restore her lost authority. The admiral had gained an ascendancy at Court hardly inferior to that once exercised by the great Catholic duke. That nice balance of the rival factions which Catherine had laboured so incessantly to maintain was now lost, and until it was restored, she must remain as powerless and dependent as in the days when Mary Stewart was queen. Rather than bear this fresh humiliation, Catherine resolved that the admiral should die. Her purpose, she vainly imagined, would be accomplished by the sacrifice of the Protestant leader; and in the first instance, at least, she aimed at that alone. But the assassin who had been hired for the occasion failed to execute his purpose. On Friday the 22d of August, only four days after the royal wedding, the admiral was wounded severely in the arm by a shot from an arquebuse. The news spread rapidly through Paris, and the young king was furious at the outrage, which was committed in open day, and when Coligni was only a few paces distant from the door of his hotel. Charles lost no time in visiting the admiral. He expressed the warmest sympathy for his sufferings, and assured him that effectual means should be taken for the discovery and the punishment of the assassin; nor is there any reason to suppose that the emotion exhibited by the king was feigned. Charles was accompanied by his mother and her favourite son the Duke of Anjou. It was they who had employed the bungling assassin,

whom they cursed in secret, while they lamented even more loudly than the king the sufferings of their victim. Charles, at the admiral's request, remained with him some time alone; and when Catherine and the Duke of Anjou took their leave, they were justly alarmed at the fierce and threatening looks and gestures of the Huguenot cavaliers, who by this time were flocking round the admiral's hotel, inquiring eagerly after the condition of their chief, and vowing vengeance against his enemies. Catherine and her accomplice hurried to the Louvre. They dared not avow to the king, in his present humour, that they had planned the murder; yet without the consent of Charles nothing could be done. It had by this time been ascertained that the assassin had fled from Paris on a horse belonging to the Duke of Guise, and a conflict was every moment expected to break out between his followers and those of Coligni. But the day passed without further bloodshed, and in the morning Catherine hoped to find the king more amenable to reason.

Next day, accordingly, Catherine and her accomplices met in secret conclave. In addition to the Duke of Anjou there were present Gondi the Count de Retz, the Chancellor Birago, Gonzaga the Duke de Nevers, and the Marshal Tavannes.[1] What passed at this memorable meeting is unknown; but we may assume from what followed that Catherine found little difficulty in persuading such counsellors that the murder of Coligni and his friends was now a matter

[1] It has often been remarked that the massacre was planned by foreigners. The Duke of Anjou was the only Frenchman present, and he was the son of Catherine de Medici. Tavannes was a Spaniard.

of necessity. After a brief consultation they proceeded in a body to the cabinet of the king, and explained the purport of their visit.[1] But from the project of the massacre Charles recoiled with horror. For this Catherine was fully prepared, and with the subtlety of Satan she answered one by one his objections to the scheme. History contains few darker pictures than that of a mother working on the evil passions of her son to tempt him to commit an act which was to render him an object of execration through all time. Charles, to his credit, remained deaf to all her arguments. But the wily Florentine had one still in reserve of which her son had never dreamed; and finding all persuasion vain, she at length informed him, with startling candour, that it was not the Duke of Guise, as he supposed, but she herself and her son Henry, who had planned the murder of Coligni. "It is true," she dexterously added, "that we sought the admiral's life, but we did it to save yours. You have now no choice but to finish the work we have begun, or to perish with your brother and your mother."

This astounding announcement threw Charles into one of those paroxysms of fury to which, when under strong excitement, he was ever subject. He fiercely denounced his mother's treachery, and threatened his brother and the rest of the conspirators, until, exhausted with the violence of his emotions, he sank into a kind of silent stupor. He then declared that the admiral was his guest, that he could not allow

[1] This visit to the king bears a curious resemblance to the visit paid by Murray, Bothwell, and their accomplices, to Mary at Craigmillar, when they proposed to get rid of Darnley—vol. i. 163.

him to be injured, and implored his mother, whose influence over him, notwithstanding this outburst of passion, was still supreme, to devise some other plan, by which the life of Coligni might be spared. At this point Charles found an unexpected ally in one of the conspirators. Whether moved by remorse, or by compassion for the unhappy monarch, Gondi, to the surprise of his accomplices, now besought the king to refuse his assent to a crime which would bring eternal infamy on France. If the advice of Gondi was honestly given, which may well be doubted, we can easily imagine the feelings with which Catherine listened to her countryman, who thus threatened to defeat the plans of the conspirators just at the moment when they were all but realised. But she dissembled whatever resentment she may have felt, and calmly told the king that the advice of Gondi came too late. Notwithstanding, however, all that she and her accomplices could say, the king still obstinately refused his assent to their murderous scheme. Another hour was spent, in argument and entreaty upon their part, and in recrimination upon his, without effect. But the contest was unequal between the most wicked woman that ever wore a crown and a wayward youth whose fiery passions she had never attempted to soothe or to control. To the last, Charles struggled to exempt from slaughter the admiral and the young Rochefoucauld, who was an especial favourite of the king; but the infernal conclave was inexorable, and at length, in another paroxysm of fury, he gave his assent to the massacre, and rushed like a maniac from the apartment.

There was not a moment to be lost. The king

might relent; he might even in a fit of rage or remorse divulge the secret to the admiral. The conspirators determined to proceed that very night. Henry of Guise, who from his childhood had been nurtured in the belief that Coligni was his father's murderer, was forthwith summoned to the Louvre. To him was intrusted the attack on the admiral's hotel, with which the work of slaughter was to commence. To the other districts of the city other leaders were appointed, and the general military superintendence of the massacre was committed to Marshal Tavannes. It was finally settled that the great bell of the Palace of Justice, which could be distinctly heard throughout the city, was to sound the death-knell of the Huguenots in Paris.

It was long past midnight before all the preparations were completed. The king had spent the greater part of the day in the solitude of his chamber. When any of the conspirators ventured to approach him, he repelled them with frowns and muttered threats; and he was especially incensed against his brother, whom he erroneously supposed to be the chief contriver of the plot. Catherine strove to soothe the king by the hypocritical assurance that mercy to the guilty was cruelty to the innocent, and he was silenced if not convinced by her devices; but to the last moment the conspirators were in dread lest he should betray them. Even Catherine herself began to show symptoms of uneasiness as the fatal hour approached, and she listened anxiously with her accomplices for the preconcerted signal. But the great bell was silent still; and accompanied by the Duke of Anjou and Gondi, she stepped out on a balcony which commanded a view of

the sleeping city. It was shrouded in the gloom which immediately precedes the dawn; and the oppressive stillness of the scene, and the sickening suspense, proved too much even for the iron nerves of the queen-mother. The horrors and the dangers of the crime she had so calmly meditated now rose to her guilty fancy in their true colours; and when, just as the day was breaking, the report of a pistol fired by an unknown hand startled the royal assassin, she hastily despatched a messenger to the Duke of Guise, desiring him to spare the admiral. But her repentance — the result, according to an eyewitness,[1] not of compassion for her victim, but of terror for herself —was now of no avail, for the messenger speedily returned with the tidings that Coligni was already dead. The feast of blood had begun, and no human power could now restrain the fiendish appetite of the populace of Paris. Long had they cherished a deadly hatred of the Huguenots; the day of vengeance had come at last, and such a day had never yet been witnessed in all the annals of religious strife.[2]

At Rome and at Madrid,[3] where the alliance between

[1] The Marshal Tavannes.

[2] The above narrative has been chiefly drawn from Henry Martin, Histoire de France; Soldan Protestantismus in Frankreich; and the recent work entitled the 'Massacre of St Bartholomew,' by Henry White, in which the various authorities on the subject are carefully and ably examined.

[3] It has been often asserted that the exultation manifested at Rome and at Madrid on the occasion of the massacre proved the complicity of the Pope and of Philip in the plot. But as we have no evidence of this, we must look for another explanation of their conduct, and that is readily furnished by the fact that the explosion in Paris was not only unlooked for, but that it instantly relieved the Papal Court and the King of Spain from a great peril which they thought they saw impending—

Charles and the Huguenots had caused the most serious alarm, the unlooked-for intelligence of the massacre was received with unbounded satisfaction. The Pope was relieved from all anxiety respecting the fidelity of the eldest son of the Church; and Philip, for the first time in his life, was seen to laugh. He had good reason; for the death of Coligni saved him a war with France, which at this time he was most anxious to avoid. Throughout Protestant Europe, and more especially in England and in Scotland, the massacre of Paris was regarded with mingled horror and consternation. That it had been long premeditated, and that Charles had invited Coligni and his friends to the royal wedding with the deliberate purpose of putting them to death, became fixed articles of belief with every true Reformer. It was inevitable, under the circumstances, that the utmost animosity should be kindled against the professors of the ancient faith, and that the wildest rumours should be circulated regarding their designs against the Protestants of Britain. On the prospects of the Scottish queen, especially in Scotland,[1] the news of the massacre exercised a most disastrous effect. Knox was now a dying man, but

namely, the approaching apostasy of the eldest son of the Church. They well knew that the breach between the house of Valois and the Protestants was henceforth irreparable.

[1] On the 3d of October a proclamation was issued at Edinburgh by the regent, "for the convention of the professors of the true religion within the realm, to consult and deliberate upon the imminent dangers and conspiracies of the Papists." This document asserted that "the great murders and more than beastly cruelties" perpetrated abroad, "and proceeding, no doubt, out of that unhappy, devilish, and terrible Council of Trent," were intended to be followed by persecutions of still greater cruelty, if that were possible, against the Christians of Scotland. Commissioners from the whole kingdom were therefore summoned to meet in Edinburgh on the 20th of the same month, to concert measures against the common danger.—Bannatyne, Memorials, 271.

he still retained strength enough to denounce with all his pristine powers the unparalleled perfidy of the house of Valois, and to proclaim aloud, in the spirit of the ancient prophets, that no descendant of the perjured king should ever mount the throne of France. Knox only expressed, in his own emphatic language, the general sentiments of his countrymen on the occasion—for Catholics as well as Protestants regarded with abhorrence the butchery of St Bartholomew; and as France was the only quarter whence the partisans of the queen could at this time look for substantial aid, a prejudice was created against both them and their Continental allies, which the regent and his friends sought to aggravate to the utmost of their power.

Meanwhile Lord Burghley did not fail to perceive that the occasion was highly opportune for at length ridding Sheffield Castle of its dangerous inmate. He knew that, right or wrong, popular prejudice would connect the Scottish queen in some way with the massacre; and, a few days after the news reached England, Sandys, the Bishop of London, very probably at the instigation of the Lord Treasurer, recommended in plain terms "that her head should be cut off forthwith."[1] This truly orthodox advice was tendered by the Bishop on the 8th of September; and two days later, Henry Killigrew received instructions to proceed to Scotland on a very secret and important mission, the object of which it is now necessary to explain.

Burghley, it appears, had by this time discovered his egregious blunder in making a prisoner of the Scottish queen; for Killigrew is first of all informed that "nothing presently is more necessary than that the realm might be relieved of her."[2] And although,

[1] See Wright, i. 439.

[2] Murdin, 225.

he added, she might be lawfully put to death in England,[1] it seemed "for certain respects better" that she should be delivered up to the Regent of Scotland and his friends, provided they would undertake the part of executioners; "for," added the Lord Treasurer, who seemed now fully alive to the errors of his past policy, "to have her and to keep her were of all others the most dangerous." But this proposal was not to be made in form to the Scottish regent. Killigrew was to represent to him the great inconvenience of detaining Mary in England; and if he failed to take the hint, the envoy was to suggest, "as if from himself," that if an offer were made to relieve the English queen of her now unwelcome guest, it might probably at this critical time be accepted. But this suggestion was only to be made in case of absolute necessity, for Killigrew was to endeavour, if possible, to induce the regent to open the matter in the first instance to him. No one was acquainted with the real object of Killigrew's mission except Burghley, Leicester, and Elizabeth herself; and she appears to have consented with reluctance to the scheme, for she declared, in the presence of her two ministers and of Killigrew, that they were the only persons intrusted with the secret, and that if it was ever divulged, they certainly should answer for it. Killigrew replied that "he would keep the secret as he would his life,"[2] and immediately set out for Scotland.

That Elizabeth believed herself to be in real danger at this time, and that Burghley took advantage of her fears to obtain her consent to the scheme, is highly probable. But view it as we may, the proceeding was infamous in the extreme. She had bribed the

[1] Upon what pretext he does not say. [2] Tytler, vii. 313.

Scots to sell Northumberland, she would bribe them now to kill their queen; and she rightly judged that the men who had received the price of Percy's blood would be no less willing to treat for that of Mary Stewart. On his arrival in Scotland, the first object of Killigrew was to find out "a fit instrument," to use his own words, to sound the regent; and in Nicolas Elphinstone, who, two years before,[1] had been employed by the Regent Murray to obtain the surrender of the Scottish queen, he discovered one in all respects adapted to his purpose. On the authority of this most willing agent, Killigrew, on the 19th of September, informed Lord Burghley that he expected "the regent and the Earl of Morton would soon break their minds unto him secretly."[2] The Lord Treasurer, in reply, fearing, no doubt, that his mistress might at any moment change her mind, urged Killigrew to lose no time in proceeding with the business, "which daily, yea hourly," occupied his thoughts. The envoy was well aware of the necessity of expedition, and proved himself both active and discreet. The Earl of Morton, whose consent was essential to the proposed surrender of the queen, was at the time confined to bed by sickness; but, like his old accomplice Ruthven, he was ready enough, when there was a murder to be done, to forget his bodily ailments. After some preliminary communications, he invited the regent and the English envoy to a secret interview at his castle of Dalkeith, where "the great matter," as Killigrew described it, was at length discussed. No one else was present; and, as might have been expected, there was a good

[1] *Ante*, vol. i. 510.

[2] Burghley to Killigrew, 29th September; Cotton MSS.

deal of fencing before anything definite was said. At length Killigrew, to bring the matter to a point, said, in accordance with his instructions, that unless they desired him to write on the subject upon which they had met, he would upon no account move in the matter. Upon this Morton raised himself in his bed, and declared that both he and the regent desired the queen's death, "as a sovereign salve for all their sores." He further said that some kind of ceremony or process would be necessary, and that the noblemen and clergy must be summoned to witness her death, "after *a secret manner*." Morton further added—and the fact is instructive—that the Queen of England would require "to send such a convoy with the party *that, in case there were people would not like of it*, they might be able to keep the field." On these conditions, he assured Killigrew that the royal captive should be put to death within three hours of her arrival in Scotland.[1]

It is very evident from the last stipulation made by Morton, that, notwithstanding the unpromising aspect of affairs, the queen's friends in Scotland were still so numerous that he could not venture to take her life without the presence of an English force; and that he should have stipulated for the aid of English troops for such a purpose, is not the least of the crimes with which his memory is stained. With respect to the Regent Mar, Killigrew complained that he found him more "cold than Morton;" but the latter privately informed him that, if the regent showed any hesitation in the business, it could be done without him, as he himself was lieutenant-general of the whole of Scotland

[1] Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 9th October 1572; Caligula. c. iii. 375.—See Appendix C.

south of the Tay, and could on his own authority, in case of need, come to terms with the English Government respecting the murder of his sovereign.[1]

But it soon appeared that the coldness of Mar arose, not from any moral scruples, but from the apparent difficulty of carrying into effect Lord Burghley's scheme. As soon as the regent was assured that it was practicable, he showed himself quite as eager as Morton for its speedy execution. A few days after the meeting at Dalkeith, Killigrew had an interview with him at Stirling, and was pleased to find that all traces of doubt and hesitation had passed away. Mar took the opportunity, at the same time, of informing the English envoy that he was much in want of money for the payment of his troops, and expressed a hope that, under the circumstances, Elizabeth would furnish him with a supply.[2]

Killigrew and the two earls now understood each other. It only remained to settle the terms upon which the Scottish queen should be surrendered; and Killigrew was speedily furnished with the conditions upon which Mar and Morton agreed to perform their part of the bargain. They were to the following effect: That the Queen of England should take the young King of Scots under her protection; that his claim of succession to the English crown should not be prejudiced by any sentence to be passed against his mother; and that the Earls of Huntingdon, Bedford, or Essex, accompanied with two or three thousand troops, should assist at her execution. It was further required that

[1] Killigrew to Burghley and Leicester, 13th October 1572; Cotton MSS.

[2] The same to the same, 19th October 1572; Cotton MSS.

these troops should afterwards join the forces of the regent and reduce Edinburgh Castle. The fortress was then to be delivered up to the regent, and all arrears of pay due to the Scottish forces to be paid by the Queen of England.

These demands appeared to Burghley unreasonably high, and he complained bitterly of their extortionate character.[1] But the circumstances were unprecedented; the project he had in hand was fraught with danger to all concerned, and it was unreasonable to expect that Mar and Morton would run the necessary risk without a proportionate reward. To give up a fugitive to an enemy had from the earliest ages[2] been regarded as an unpardonable crime; but to bargain, in addition, for the death of the victim, was an atrocity peculiar to this. Burghley and his mistress, moreover, upon their part, had taken the precaution to stipulate that they should have ample security for the due performance of the murderous contract. Certain noblemen, to be named by the regent, were to repair

[1] Burghley to Leicester, 3d November 1572; Cotton MSS.

[2] A striking example is related by Herodotus. He informs us that when Pactyas the Lydian, who had excited a revolt against the great Cyrus, fled to Cyme, the Persian king demanded that his enemy should be delivered up. The Cymeans consulted the oracle in the following terms: "To avoid a cruel death from the Persians, Pactyas, a Lydian, fled to us for refuge; the Persians require us to deliver him into their hands: much as we fear their power, we fear still more to withdraw our protection from a suppliant." The oracle being, no doubt, under Persian influence, replied that the fugitive should be given up. But it was disobeyed notwithstanding; for, instead of handing him over to Cyrus, the Cymeans furnished Pactyas with the means of escaping to the Greek Islands. Nor does their refusal to give up his rebellious subject appear to have been in any way resented by the great king.—Cary's Herod., i. 160. It is curious to find that, during the reign of the great Cyrus, a higher tone of international morality prevailed than in the days of Elizabeth.

to England, and there to remain as hostages[1] until their sovereign was put to death. In other words, they were to pledge their lives that Mar and Morton should kill their queen. Is there any other instance on record where hostages were required as security for the perpetration of a murder?

Before, however, any agreement was concluded, the sudden death of the Regent Mar, who expired at Stirling on the 28th of October after a very short illness,[2] put an end to the negotiations. It was a startling coincidence that twice within two years the surrender of Mary to her enemies should have been prevented by the unexpected death of a Scottish regent. With the Regent Murray the bargain had actually been completed at the time he was struck down;[3] and had Mar lived, as both parties were equally eager for Mary's death, we cannot doubt that they would eventually have come to terms. It was a just retribution on Burghley and his mistress that they should find themselves hopelessly saddled with a prisoner whom they dared neither to set at liberty nor to put to death.

The Lord Treasurer gave vent to his chagrin in a strain of pious sentiment somewhat unusual with him. To his brother conspirator Leicester, he even expressed a fear that their mistress had grievously offended the Almighty by refusing to imbrue her hands in her cousin's blood.[4] Meanwhile their intended victim remained wholly unconscious of the danger to which she had been exposed. So well had the secret been kept

[1] Killigrew's letter of 9th October.—Appendix C.
[2] Tytler, vii. 323. [3] Vol. i. 510.
[4] Burghley to Walsingham, 3d Nov. 1572; Cotton MSS.

by those intrusted with it, both in England and in Scotland, that not the slightest allusion to it is to be found either in the correspondence of the queen or of her friends. It must be admitted that the few persons who were in the secret had every motive for preserving silence.

Whether Knox was one of these, is a question which cannot be positively answered in the affirmative; but the evidence of his complicity in Burghley's plot is all but conclusive. That the Reformer was acquainted with the negotiations for the surrender of the queen which were put an end to by the death of the Regent Murray, we cannot doubt.[1] It is notorious that both in public and in private he had subsequently denounced her as a murderess, and declared that she ought to die the death. Bearing these things in mind, we are not surprised to learn that, by the directions of Lord Burghley, Killigrew, on his arrival[2] in Scotland, sought an interview with the Reformer. What passed between them we do not know, for the letter in which the English envoy described the interview has disappeared. But in a subsequent letter of the 6th of October, addressed to Lord Burghley, he says,—"The postscript of your lordship's letter I answer thus: I trust to satisfy Morton; and for John Knox, *that thing, you may see by my despatch to Mr Secretary, is done.*"[3] He then goes on to describe Knox's feeble

[1] *Ante*, vol. i. 508.

[2] Knox's secretary has made an entry of the date of Killigrew's arrival as follows: "The 12th of September Mr Killigraue, a guid and godly Protestant, came to Edinburgh." Of the object of his visit the secretary seems to have been wholly ignorant.—Bannatyne, Memorials, 265.

[3] See Appendix C. I have made a careful search both at the British Museum and at the Record Office for the despatch here referred to, but it is not preserved in either of those repositories.

state of health, and to repeat his warnings that no faith should be kept with the "Castilians"—meaning Kirkaldy, Maitland, and their friends, who still held Edinburgh Castle for the queen.

In another letter, written three days later, Killigrew, speaking of the proposed execution of the queen, says he is certain that "all the ministers"—for he makes no exception—"would be right glad of it." Taken in connection with what he had said so shortly before of Knox, and bearing in mind the rabid hostility of the Reformer to his sovereign, we cannot but conclude that he both knew and approved of Burghley's plot.

That Knox was sincere in his religious professions, no one has ever doubted; but that his notions of right and wrong were obscured, if not destroyed, by his intemperate zeal, is equally apparent. Because he believed in all the dismal dogmas of Calvin, he seems to have deemed it to be his privilege and his duty to make the most outrageous accusations against every one who differed with him in opinion; and that two such distinguished disciples of reform as Kirkaldy and Maitland should have wholly abandoned their friends for the party of the queen, appears at this time to have exasperated him to the utmost. Although unable to mount the pulpit without assistance, he publicly denounced the one as "a murderer and a cut-throat,"[1] and the other as an "atheist."[2] The Laird of Grange was not a man to submit in silence to such imputations; and he addressed a letter to John Craig, the colleague of Knox, calling upon him publicly to deny the charge, and further to declare that of the two "Knox was the most desirous of innocent blood,"

[1] Bannatyne, i. 72 *et seq.* [2] Ibid., 281.

and that he was ready to incur the instant vengeance of heaven if he did not speak the truth. The pointed allusion to the Reformer's thirst "for innocent blood" referred clearly to his notorious enmity to the queen.

As Craig, who was a man of peace, refused to interfere in the controversy, Kirkaldy laid his complaint before the Kirk-Session of Edinburgh, a court composed of laymen as well as clergy; and Knox finally attempted an explanation of the charge he had made against his former friend. He asserted that although Kirkaldy might not be a murderer in fact, he was a "murderer in his heart;"[1] that John the Evangelist had pronounced the hatred of the heart to be murder before God, and that "whosoever loved not his brother was a manslayer." This line of argument may well surprise us in the mouth of one to whom Christian charity, in its true and noble sense, was a thing unknown—who had rejoiced over the murders of Cardinal Beaton and the Duke of Guise, who had exulted at the untimely death of Francis II., who had been an accessory to the assassination of Riccio, who had prayed for the death of his sovereign, who had plotted for her surrender into the hands of her mortal enemies, and who was even accused of having plotted in secret against the life of Darnley, whose tragical fate he never ceased in public to deplore. But we are often quick to perceive, and prone to condemn, in others, the vices most conspicuous in ourselves; and when Knox asserted that Kirkaldy was a murderer in his heart, it probably never occurred to him that the charge might have been made with far more justice against himself.

[1] Bannatyne, 77.

We have said that Knox had been accused of plotting against the life of Darnley; and it is to be observed that the charge was made, not by his Catholic enemies, but by a brother minister of the Reformed Kirk. One Robert Hamilton of St Andrews openly declared about this time that, "if all things were well tried, John Knox was as great a murderer as any Hamilton in Scotland;"[1] and that he had signed the bond for the murder of Darnley at Perth, along with the Earl of Murray, shortly before the queen's marriage in 1565. Now we have no proof that Knox signed any such bond, nor indeed that any such bond existed; but we know that both he and his father-in-law, Lord Ochiltree, were acting in concert with Murray at this time in his efforts to prevent the marriage.[2] Knox had even endeavoured on that occasion to induce the people of Edinburgh to take up arms against the queen, but he exerted all his powers in vain. It is extremely probable, therefore, that he was in the confidence of Murray and Argyll when they planned[3] the seizure of Darnley, as he certainly was some months later when they planned the death of Riccio. If we are to believe the biographer and panegyrist of Knox, Hamilton afterwards withdrew the accusation, or rather denied that he had ever made it. But it is to be observed that, in replying to it, Knox denied only that he had signed a bond for Darnley's murder—a fact quite consistent with his knowledge and approval of the plot.[4]

Maitland was no less prompt in replying to the charge of atheism than Kirkaldy had been in denying that of murder. The secretary complained to the

[1] Bannatyne, 260.
[2] Tytler, vi. 346.
[3] Vol. i. 108.
[4] Bannatyne, 261.

kirk-session of the slanderous words of Knox, and required that he should either be compelled to prove that they were true, or otherwise that he should be dealt with as they might think fit; "at least," he added, "that ye receive not hereafter every word proceeding from his mouth as oracles, and know that he is but a man subject to vanity."[1]

Knox was becoming daily more feeble, but he continued to take a lively interest in public affairs to the last; and his political and religious hatreds were in no degree weakened by the near approach of death. He replied to the complaint of Maitland that it was well known to all men that he was a perpetual disturber of the public peace, which plainly showed that he denied there was a God to punish such mischiefs;[2] and as Buchanan had quoted Cato the Censor to prove that Mary Stewart was a murderess, Knox quoted the 9th Psalm to prove that Maitland was an atheist. But like most ecclesiastical demagogues, the Reformer did not excel in argument. He could move with astonishing effect the passions of a friendly audience; and the intensity of his convictions, his profound belief in the wickedness of his opponents, and his dauntless and domineering temper, eminently fitted him to be the leader of a religious revolution, of which popular violence was the most conspicuous instrument. At the commencement of his public career he had found Maitland on the side of his opponents; for while he was hounding on the mob to the work of destruction at Perth and St Andrews, the secretary was the chief adviser of Mary of Lorraine. But from the time that Maitland abandoned her service until he

[1] Bannatyne, 281, 282. [2] Ibid., 284.

finally joined the party of her daughter, he had been the constant ally of Knox. Now, towards the close of their lives, the two men, by far the most remarkable that Scotland in that age produced, had become once more antagonists. Between the most vehement of Reformers and the most versatile of politicians, there never could have been any genuine sympathy. We cannot believe that Knox ever cordially trusted Maitland; and to a man of Maitland's temperament, the overweening arrogance of Knox must have been especially offensive. But for the time their alliance was a political necessity; and each in his own sphere exercised over his countrymen an incalculable amount of influence. There was, indeed, much truth in the allegation of Knox that the secretary was the chief author of all the troubles which had in his time afflicted England as well as Scotland. In all the important transactions of the past ten years he had taken a leading part; and what a flood of light he might have thrown upon the secret history of that stormy time! If he had dared to speak, he might have now explained the true motives for Murray's rebellion, and the true cause of Riccio's murder. He might probably have told that it was he who first flattered Bothwell with the hopes of marrying the queen, as we know he had subsequently tempted the Duke of Norfolk in England. He could have told who first proposed the Craigmillar bond, and who were the real murderers of Darnley. He alone could have laid bare the secrets of the double plot against Bothwell and the queen, and the true history of the forged letters of the casket. He could have thoroughly exposed the deep treachery of Murray, the tortuous policy of Cecil, and the helpless vacillations

of Elizabeth throughout the conferences at York and Westminster. All this he might have told, and infinitely more; but he was silent,[1] for the obvious reason that he dared not criminate others without proclaiming to the world his own pre-eminent share of guilt.

No statesman ever enjoyed among his contemporaries a higher reputation for ability. All men distrusted, yet all deferred to him; and every party to which he successively gave his services tacitly acknowledged him as leader. It was not without reason that he acquired this remarkable ascendancy, for his talents were eminently of the practical kind. He was ready and eloquent of speech; brimful of resources; and while others hesitated, ever prepared to act decisively and boldly. He was not one of those politicians who look far into futurity, for his sole ambition seemed to be to adapt himself to the exigencies of the hour; and this he did with singular success. His knowledge of men was unerring; and in playing on their weaknesses he showed unrivalled skill. He was a scholar, too, and in his diplomatic controversies could cite an apt quotation from Demosthenes, or a witty line from Chaucer, to silence or to ridicule an adversary. Machia-

[1] In a conversation with Craig, the colleague of Knox, Maitland related an anecdote of Lord Lindsay as follows: He says that, before the conferences at York and Westminster, Lindsay, a man of hot and choleric temper, flatly refused to accompany the Regent Murray to England, declaring, "with a great oath," that if forced to go, he would spoil all by telling the truth. Lindsay, who was not in the plot against Darnley, was finally induced to go to Westminster, by what means we are not informed, but probably on the promise that he should not be called as a witness before Elizabeth's commissioners, and be compelled to state the real circumstances under which Mary was compelled to resign her crown at Lochleven.—Bannatyne, Memorials.

velli recommends his prince not to choose a man of genius for his minister; and no better illustration of the wisdom of the Florentine can be found than in the history of Maitland. Had he possessed less talent and more honesty, it would have been far better for his country and himself. He might have been the guide and the protector of his youthful sovereign through the countless dangers which beset her at every step. He, and he alone, could have taught her how to rule those fierce and lawless nobles who were sworn enemies alike of the people and the Crown. But a steady and consistent course of conduct had no attractions for that restless spirit. In the world of politics he was from first to last a gambler, not from necessity, but choice. He could only breathe freely in an atmosphere of treason; and if in the prosecution of a cherished scheme forgery or murder became essential to success, such obstacles, by stimulating his ingenuity and daring, were more calculated to attract than to scare him from his project. Such was William Maitland, the "chameleon of politics," as he was justly nicknamed by Buchanan—"the flower of the wits of Scotland," according to Elizabeth[1]—over whom he acquired, and to the last maintained, a degree of influence which his rare powers of intellect can alone explain. There must indeed have been something strangely attractive about the man; for although he was universally known to be the most faithless of politicians, no one seems to have ever spoken harshly of him excepting Knox.[2] It is by no means improbable,

[1] Elizabeth to Sussex, 11th August 1870; Record Office.

[2] Although a sharp correspondence ensued between Maitland and Sussex after the secretary finally joined the party of the queen, the earl interfered on his behalf, as the following peremptory letter addressed to

indeed, that Elizabeth regarded the attitude of the secretary at this time with secret approval. She had reproached him bitterly[1] with his ingratitude when he joined the rebellion of Morton; she could hardly blame him for the devotion he was exhibiting now to the sovereign to whom he owed so much.

By his tardy return to the path of duty, Maitland did indeed make some atonement for his crimes. But his former good fortune had now deserted him, and the appalling events in France had destroyed all immediate hopes of succour from abroad. Like his antagonist Knox, moreover, he was now a mere wreck. Both men were worn out before their time by excessive mental toil. But although hopelessly paralysed,[2] and

Randolph, who was at the time in Scotland, will show: "Master Randolph, I hear that Lethington is put to the horn—his lands and goods confiscated and seized. If it be so, it doth not accord with the good faith the queen's majesty meant in the articles accorded between her highness and the Bishop of Ross, nor with the writing I subscribed; and therefore I have written to the regent (Lennox) and others in that matter. And although I, for my part, be too simple to be made a minister in princes' causes, yet, truly, I weigh mine own honour so much as I will not be made a minister to subscribe to anything wherein my good faith and true meaning should be abused to my dishonour, or any person trusting to that he shall accord in writing with me should thereby be by fraud deceived."—Dated 8th October 1570; quoted by Tytler, vii. 283.

[1] See vol. i. 359.

[2] In Bannatyne's Memorials we have a graphic account of the secretary, who some months before had arrived from the north at Leith: "On Tuysday the 10 of Aprile, the heid of wit, the secretare, landit in the nycht at Leith, whair he remayned till the morne, and was borne up with sex workmen, with sling and ling, and Mr Robert Maitland hauldding up his heid. And when they had put him in at the castle yeat, ilk ane of the workmen got three shillings, which they receavit grudginglie, hoping to have gottin mair for their labouris. And being put in the Lord Home's chalmer, he maid the lord exceading angrie that he sould be dislodged for sic a one." Lord Home had now declared for the queen, and was with Kirkaldy in Edinburgh Castle.—Bannatyne, p. 110.

confined to his chamber in the castle, he was plotting and scheming as busily as ever, still hopeful of fresh aid from France, still confident of ultimate success. There was but one contingency to fear, and that was the active intervention of the Queen of England. He well knew that Kirkaldy could hold the castle against any Scottish force that could be brought against him.

On the 24th of November John Knox died;[1] and on the same day Morton, who had virtually ruled the party of the young king since the death of Murray, was elected to the regency.[2] A few days before, he paid a visit to the Reformer, and the first question he put to the regent elect was remarkable. He asked him if he "knew anything of the king's murder."[3] What caused him to recur to such a subject at such a time? Darnley had been in his grave five years and more, and Knox had ever since, in public and in private, denounced the queen as his murderess. What now induced the dying man to suspect that his patron Morton might be in the secret? Is it possible that, as he felt his end approaching, some vague, uneasy apprehension filled his mind—a fear lest, at the instigation of the guilty, he had accused the innocent? We cannot tell; but the incident is worthy to be noted, as well as the important fact that during his latter days he had ceased to revile the queen. We need hardly add that Morton stopped his inquiries at once by falsely denying all knowledge of the murder.

[1] Tytler, vii. 330.

[2] Ibid.

[3] "First of all he speirit gif I knew anything of the king's murder. I answered, indeed I knew nothing of it."—Confession of Morton in Bannatyne's Memorials, 326.

That Knox died poor is a circumstance that has been often mentioned to his credit; but before claiming for him the virtue of disinterestedness, his admirers ought to show that he ever had the opportunity of acquiring riches. It is notorious that, after the religious revolution of 1560, the Protestant nobles laid their hands on the great bulk of the Church lands and revenues. No one denounced their rapacity more than Knox himself, or complained more bitterly of the poverty to which they had reduced the clergy. It is difficult, therefore, to see how, as a minister of the Reformed Kirk, Knox could have acquired wealth. But it may be conceded that worldly wealth was not the aim of his ambition. The prize for which he toiled and fought was spiritual dominion; and compared with that, he regarded everything as worthless. He was the Hildebrand of Calvinism, and in his own narrow sphere was every whit as intolerant and overbearing as the most ambitious of the Pontiffs. In alluding to his poverty, he would boast at times that he might, if he had chosen, have obtained, through Lord Burghley, a wealthy bishopric in England. But he was at all times given to exaggeration; and beyond his own assertion, we have no proof of this very improbable fact.[1] By his

[1] In Killigrew's letter to Lord Burghley of the 6th of October, we find the following passage relating to an interview he had just had with Knox: "He" (Knox) "said, further, that it was not long of your lordship that he was not a great bishop in England," &c.—Caligula, c. iii. 371. We may perhaps infer from this passage that Burghley had flattered the Reformer at some time with the prospect of a mitre. But if so, he had done it to serve some temporary purpose; for he well knew that Elizabeth utterly detested Knox, and would never have consented to make him a bishop. It was in the reign of Edward VI. that the Duke of Northumberland recommended the king to appoint him to the see of Rochester.—See Works of John Knox, by David Laing, iii. 81.

second wife, Margaret Stewart, a daughter of Lord Ochiltree, he left three young children, upon whom an annuity was settled by the General Assembly. His widow subsequently married Andrew Ker of Faudonside, described by the latest and best biographer of Knox as "a strenous supporter of the Reformation."[1] We have seen that he had given signal proofs of his sincerity in the cause by holding his pistol to the queen's breast during the murder of Riccio,[2] and by his presence at the Kirk-of-Field[3] when Darnley was in the hands of his assassins.

By his elevation to the regency, Morton had at length attained the summit of his ambition; and he proceeded with characteristic craft to consolidate his power. It was fortunate for him that his opponents at this time were without an acknowledged head. Huntly and the Hamiltons, from the extent of their possessions and the number of their vassals, had long been regarded as the chiefs of the queen's party in Scotland; but Kirkaldy and Maitland were acting independently of their noble allies: and if the regent could come to terms with either section of the queen's partisans, he might hope speedily to overcome the other.

He accordingly, through Sir James Melvill, offered to treat with Kirkaldy for the surrender of the castle, on conditions highly advantageous to the latter;[4] and had Grange and Maitland been prepared to abandon the cause they had adopted, they had now an excel-

[1] M'Crie, 394. [2] *Ante*, vol. i. 139. [3] *Ante*, vol. i. 246.

[4] He offered him, according to Melvill, the bishopric of St Andrews—that is, the revenues attached to the see—as well as the castle of Blackness.—Memoirs, 118.

lent opportunity of coming to terms with the regent. But Kirkaldy declined to treat unless Huntly and the Hamiltons were also parties to the agreement—in other words, unless there was a general peace. Melvill returned highly pleased with the result of his mission; but to his surprise Morton expressed his disappointment, and he at once explained the cause. "James," he said, "I will be plain with you. It is not my interest to agree with them all, for then their faction will be as strong as ever it was; thereby they may some day circumvent me if they please,—therefore it is my game to divide them. And, moreover, there have been great troubles in this country this while bygone, and during them great wrongs and extortions committed, for the which some fashion of punishment must be made; and I would rather that the crimes should be laid upon the Hamiltons, the Earl of Huntly, and their adherents, than upon your friends; *and by their wreck I will get more profit* than by that of those in the castle, that have not so great lands to escheat to us as the reward of our labours."[1]

Nothing could be plainer than the regent's language. He desired to come to terms with Kirkaldy and his friends that he might be enabled to crush Huntly and the Hamiltons, and forfeit their broad lands, which in extent and value far exceeded those of the "Castilians." Melvill accordingly returned to the castle and explained the regent's views to Grange. But Kirkaldy adhered to his resolution of making no separate treaty with Morton,[2] of whose good faith he

[1] Melvill Memoirs, 119.

[2] It appears that Kirkaldy doubted whether his friends would be equally loyal to him. Speaking of Huntly and his adherents, he said,

probably entertained strong doubts. The negotiation was accordingly broken off.

But the regent was more successful in another quarter. By means of the English envoy Killigrew, who had instructions to give Morton all the support in his power, terms of pacification were offered to Huntly and his friends at Perth. After some discussion, a formal treaty was concluded in that city on the 23d of February 1573,[1] by which the chiefs of the queen's party acknowledged Morton as regent, while he engaged in the name of the infant king that all acts of forfeiture passed against Huntly and his friends should be rescinded. In accordance with this treaty, Sir Adam Gordon, who had so long maintained the queen's authority in the north, laid down his arms and shortly afterwards retired to France; and the whole of Scotland, with the exception of Edinburgh Castle, was subjected to the authority of the regent.

Amid these transactions Killigrew did not lose sight of the "great matter" which was the true, though secret, object of his visit to Scotland; and Morton was as eager for the death of the queen as ever. But the Perth pacification had rendered the project, for a time at least, impracticable. It could

"If now they would abandon him, and agree without him and those in his company, he had deserved better at their hands; yet he had rather that they should leave and deceive him than that he should do it unto them."—Ibid.

[1] Historie of King James the Sext; Bannatyne, 305. It appears that Sir James Balfour, who is said to have drawn up the bond for Darnley's murder, contrived to come to terms with his old accomplice Morton. Knox's secretary says, "Sir James Balfoure had made his moyen befoir with the regent, and so remained not in the castle with the rest of the traitouris, albeit he is als grit a traitour as ony of them all." —Bannatyne, 296.

not be expected that Huntly and the Hamiltons, with all their formidable array of friends and dependants, would consent to the murder of their sovereign. Morton well knew that a fierce renewal of the war would be the necessary and immediate consequence of such an act. It is not probable that he ventured even to sound the men who had so long acted as the chiefs of Mary's party on the subject. It is certain, at all events, that the Perth pacification put an end, for the time, to all negotiations for the surrender of the queen.[1]

The truce which had been signed between Kirkaldy and the Regent Mar on the 30th of July had been prolonged from time to time until the 1st of January,[2] when hostilities recommenced; and in spite of the Perth pacification, the "Castilians" seemed determined to hold out to the last. Maitland, who exercised unbounded influence over Grange, was fully impressed with the belief that Elizabeth would not venture to interfere in the struggle. He counted on her well-known parsimony, as well as on her reluctance at the time to break with France. Nor had he been disappointed in his expectations of foreign aid; for Sir James Kirkaldy, the brother of Grange, arrived about this time at Blackness,[3] in the Firth of Forth, with a considerable sum of money and a quantity of military stores. But by a strange accident these supplies, of which the garrison of Edinburgh stood much in need, did not reach their destination. During the absence of Sir James in France, Morton, as unscrupulous in private as he was in public life, had corrupted his wife, and she treacherously betrayed the

[1] Tytler, vii. 338 *et seq.* [2] Bannatyne, 206. [3] Ibid., 297.

secret to the regent, who caused her husband to be seized,[1] along with all the stores he had landed for the service of the queen. Notwithstanding this serious loss, the "Castilians" were not discouraged: they still looked for fresh aid from France; their artillery was decidedly superior to that of their assailants; they still had abundance of ammunition; and, provided Elizabeth did not interfere, they could defy any force the regent might bring against them.

Under these circumstances Killigrew, who still remained in Scotland, addressed on the 9th of March a most urgent letter to Lord Burghley, entreating him to lose no time in sending a sufficient force to co-operate with the regent in the capture of the castle. Although Mary's most powerful friends had been disarmed by the treaty of Perth, he described the position of affairs as still extremely critical. He had ascertained that Lord Seton, that most stanch and zealous of all Mary's partisans, had been already sounding Morton on the subject of a French alliance. He had ascertained that her ambassador in Paris had contrived to communicate with the "Castilians," and to

[1] The mode by which Morton accomplished his purpose is thus described by a contemporary: "The regent devised a subtillitye, and persuadit Sir James his awin wyfe to betray him, quhilk she did upon the tent day of Februar thaireafter, and came thair to vessit him; but when she was willing to return, she could not content unless he with his souldiers should convoy hir a peece of the way from the hous, alledging that Captain Lambie was lyand in the way to spoill hir. Bot that capten was so forseine of this stratagem that he knew weill that Sir James should be trained furth, and thairfore he lay at the bak of a hill narr the castell, behaulding the tyme; sa that howsoone he espyit Sir James to be removit from the hous he then immediately approached with his souldiers," &c. Through the treachery of his wife, Kirkaldy thus fell into the hands of the regent.—Historie of King James the Sext, 208.

assure them of the continued support of the French king. The English envoy further reminded Burghley that the Pope had consented to assist them with money, and that the bearer of the promised aid was already on his way to Scotland. In conclusion, he warned the Lord Treasurer that if the Castle of Edinburgh was not speedily taken, the work of the past twelve years must be undone, and England as well as Scotland exposed to the most serious dangers.[1]

By these arguments Elizabeth was at last convinced; and, to the unspeakable relief of Burghley, she consented to send a force to the assistance of Morton. It is true that by the treaty of Blois, which was not yet a year old, Elizabeth had bound herself not to send any troops to Scotland, except for the purpose of capturing her rebels in that country;[2] but there were none of her rebels in Edinburgh Castle, so she could not, on that pretext, send a force to the assistance of the besiegers. But the massacre of the Protestants in France had led to a renewal of the civil war; and in the distracted condition of his kingdom, Charles was not in a condition to insist on the strict performance of the treaty.[3] In spite, therefore, of the protest of the French ambassador,[4] Sir William Drury, the marshall of Berwick, received orders to march to Edinburgh with a body of troops and an ample supply of artillery, of which the regent stood much in need.

[1] Killigrew to Burghley, March 9; Record Office.

[2] See the treaty in Dumont corps diplomatique.

[3] Sir Thomas Smith, who along with Walsingham had negotiated the treaty, writing to Burghley on February 12, says: "Now, the French being thoroughly occupied, is the best time to do that enterprise which is to be done."—Wright, i. 458.

[4] Fénelon, v. 305.

Notwithstanding the efforts of the besieged, trenches were cut and batteries planted on the south, the west, and the north-west of the fortress, and on the 25th of April the bombardment commenced. Kirkaldy replied vigorously to the fire of the assailants, and knowing well that he had nothing to expect from the clemency of Morton, declared his determination of fighting to the last. But his guns were far inferior to those of the English auxiliaries; and with the slender force under his command, not amounting in all to two hundred men, he could not venture to attack the batteries. For thirty-four days they played incessantly upon the castle walls, at the end of which time the great tower, called after its founder David I., was battered to the ground. By this time, too, the well from which the garrison drew their main supply of water was choked up with rubbish, and a breach had been effected at the "spur," a strong outwork on the castle hill which covered the only entrance to the fortress. Preparations were now made for an assault, and the regent declared his intention of leading his troops in person. Perceiving that further resistance was hopeless, Kirkaldy proposed a truce for two days. His request was granted, and he offered to surrender the castle on condition that he and his friends should be allowed to live unmolested in Scotland, or to retire to France or England if they thought fit; and it appears that to these conditions Drury was willing to agree.[1] But they were peremptorily rejected by Morton, who refused to treat on any other terms than those of immediate and absolute submission. Kirkaldy and his friends well understood the meaning of Morton's mes-

[1] Tytler, vii. 344.

sage, and giving up all hopes of safety, prepared to defend themselves to the last. But the remnant of the garrison, thoroughly convinced of their desperate situation, not only refused to fight any longer, but threatened to hang Maitland over the castle walls if he did not within six hours consent to a surrender. That they should have threatened Maitland instead of their commander, affords another instance of the universal belief entertained of the influence and power exercised by that remarkable man.[1] Even he was now convinced that all was lost; but full of expedients to the last, he suggested, as a means of balking Morton, that they should surrender, not to the regent, but to the English general. Kirkaldy accordingly sent a private message to Sir William Drury, in consequence of which a body of English troops was admitted into the castle on the night of the 29th of May. Grange and his companions now formally surrendered themselves, not to the Scottish regent, but to the Queen of England. In addition to Kirkaldy and Maitland, there were in the castle at this time Lord Hume, Robert Melvill, the brother of Sir James, the Bishop of Dunkeld, and several other persons of note. Thus disappointed of his prey, Morton lost no time in representing to Lord Burghley the extreme danger of restoring to liberty the men who had been so long the chief disturbers of the public peace, and entreating that they should be delivered up to him, that they might be duly punished for their crimes.[2] Killigrew strongly advised the Lord Treasurer to accede to Mor-

[1] Killigrew described Maitland's influence over Kirkaldy as something like enchantment.—Tytler, vii. 342.

[2] Caligula, iv. 85; ibid., 101; Killigrew to Burghley, June 12, 1573.

ton's wishes; and after some delay, Drury received orders from Elizabeth to deliver up his prisoners to Morton, to be dealt with as he might think fit. Her hesitation probably arose from her unwillingness to sign that which she must have well known to be the death-warrant of Lethington. But in her letter to Drury she made no exemption in favour of any of the prisoners, and he reluctantly delivered them all into the regent's hands.[1]

Before her final answer arrived, however, Maitland was dead. From the moment of his surrender he must have known that his doom was sealed; and it was believed[2] that he preferred a voluntary death to the ignominy of a public execution. The most strenuous efforts were made to save the life of Kirkaldy, but he was too formidable an enemy to be spared. He was hanged at the market-cross of Edinburgh on the 3d of August, along with his brother Sir James Kirkaldy, whose wife was reputed to be the paramour of Morton. Several other persons of inferior rank were executed at the same time; but Lord Hume, the Bishop of Dunkeld, Robert Melvill, and other Castilians of note, were eventually set at liberty, upon what terms is not precisely known.[3]

[1] Drury to Burghley, June 18; Record Office.

[2] It was said that he took poison. Melvill says: "He died at Leith, after the old Roman fashion, as was said, to prevent him coming to the shambles with the rest," p. 122. Melvill does not speak at all positively on the subject; and it is remarkable, when we consider the prominent position occupied by Maitland, that we have no distinct evidence as to the manner of his death.—See Tytler, vii. 347; Burton, v. 379. According to Chalmers, iii. 530, Maitland was born in the year 1525, so that he was forty-eight at the time of his death. Maitland left a widow, Mary Fleming—one of the queen's four Marys—but no children.

[3] Tytler, vii. 348, 349.

It was the misfortune of Kirkaldy to live in an age when the minds of men were distracted by religious discord; and it will ever remain a blot on the fame of this gallant soldier that he not only took an active part in the barbarous murder of Cardinal Beaton, but that he was rewarded along with others for the commission of that foul deed. It may perhaps be said, in extenuation of his guilt, that a political, or, if we may use the term, a religious murder in the sixteenth century was regarded as a crime only by the friends and admirers of the victim. The Protestant assassins of Beaton and Riccio were quite as ready to justify their conduct as the Catholic Philip was, a few years later, to justify the murder of the Prince of Orange. Kirkaldy had been from his youth upwards a zealous Protestant; but without abandoning his religion, he abandoned in his latter years the party he had served so faithfully and well for the cause of his deposed and imprisoned queen. It has been said that he fell a victim to her fascinations at Carberry Hill, where she chose to surrender herself to him in preference to any of the nobles present. But this story is contradicted by the fact that, within a twelvemonth afterwards, he fought against her at Langside, where the victory was universally attributed to his military skill. It is far more probable that his final desertion of his old associates was due to the influence and the example of Maitland, who knew better than any man living the true state of the controversy between the queen and her rebellious subjects. Of one thing we may be tolerably certain, that a man of Kirkaldy's chivalrous temper would not have abandoned those with whom he had acted steadily and loyally for thirty years unless

from a profound conviction that his sovereign had been cruelly wronged.[1] Grange was just the man—if we are to believe Melvill, who knew him well—to side with the oppressed, irrespective of his worldly interests; and his heroic defence of the last stronghold of Mary Stewart relieves in some measure the wearisome scenes of treachery and bloodshed of which the history of Scotland at this period consists.

During the month of April, Mary had received intelligence of the death of her uncle the Duke d'Aumale, who had accompanied her to Scotland in 1561. He was killed, to her great grief, at the siege of Rochelle,[2] which was at that time in the possession of the Huguenots. A few weeks later she was informed by her keeper, Shrewsbury, that Edinburgh Castle and its brave defenders were in the hands of her mortal enemies. Shrewsbury even thought fit, by

[1] In Bannatyne's Memorials there is a poem of which the Laird of Grange is said to be the author, in which he assails the enemies of the queen in terms abundantly vigorous, though somewhat unpolished. The following may serve as a specimen:—

"At the Castle of Edinburch
Upon the bank baith greine and rouch
As myne alone I lay,
With paper, pen, and inke in hand,
Musing as I could understand,
Of the suddan decay
That unto this puir natioune
Appeirandly does come:
I fand our Congregatione
Was caus of all, and some
Whois aucthoris, instructoris,
Hes blindit thame so long,
That blameles and schameles
Both riche and poore they wrong.
These wicked, vaine veneniaris,
Proud poysoned Pharisanes,
With thair blind guydis but grace,
Hes caused the puire cuntrie
Assist unto thair traitōrie
Thair Prince for to displace:
For teine I can not testifie
How wrangouslie they wrocht
When thai thair Prince so piteouslie
In prisone strong had brocht;
Abused hir, accused hir,
With serpent wordis fell,
Of schavelings and rebellis,
Lyk hiddeous houndis of hell," &c.

[2] "Je suis attainte d'afflictions de tous costès: Dieu par sa grâce me soit en ayde!"—Letter to Fénelon, 11th April 1573; Labanoff, iv. 71. The duke was killed on the 14th March.

way of rendering the news more acceptable, to congratulate her on the event, and told her that she ought to be extremely grateful to Elizabeth for finally defeating and destroying her party in Scotland. Mary describes her keeper on a former occasion as coming to her with "a merry countenance" to say that the Earl of Northumberland had been delivered up.[1] These incidents give us a curious insight into the manners of the age. Although we might not be prepared to look for much refinement in the fourth husband of Bess of Hardwick, we cannot but feel some surprise that a nobleman of his rank and breeding should have thus sought to inflict needless pain upon his helpless prisoner. But Mary was too proud, and too familiar with misfortune, to give way to sorrow in the presence of her keeper. To his evident disappointment, she preserved her self-possession and composure when he exultingly informed her that her last hope in Scotland was extinguished. But he added, by way of consolation to Lord Burghley, that "although she made little show of any grief, he was sure that the news nipped her very sore."[2]

A quantity of the crown jewels which had escaped the rapacity of Murray, had been deposited in Edinburgh Castle. Morton not only seized them, but, to prevent inquiries as to their amount and value, hanged the two officers who had been intrusted with the care of them, and who were both old servants of the queen. Mary complained, through the French ambassador,[3] to

[1] See her letter to the Duke of Norfolk, *ante*, 105.

[2] Shrewsbury to Cecil, 7th June 1573; Record Office.

[3] Speaking of the appropriation of her jewels by Morton, she says:

Elizabeth on the subject, but with the usual result. We shall hear more of the jewels thus appropriated by Morton as our narrative proceeds.

"Il a faict mourir ceux qui les avoient eutre leurs mains et m'en debvoient respondre, ou pour le moins qui pouvoient tesmóignor de ce qu'il y avoit; en quoy se manifeste trop évidemment sa finesse et sa ruse."—Dated 30th November 1573; Labanoff, iv. 90.

CHAPTER XX.

THE REGENCY OF MORTON.

THE complete discomfiture of the partisans of Mary proved in one respect advantageous to that unhappy princess. As she ceased to be an object of immediate alarm, the vigilance and severity of her keepers, which had been unremitting since the discovery of Ridolphi's plot, became gradually relaxed. They now discovered that her long and close imprisonment had seriously impaired her health. The combined effect of damp, ill-ventilated rooms, and want of proper exercise, had rendered her subject; among other ailments, to severe attacks of rheumatism, as a remedy for which her physician recommended the baths of Buxton; and, in a fit of unwonted generosity, Elizabeth allowed her in the autumn of this year to visit that celebrated watering-place.

Although it was late in the season before she reached Buxton—for it had been purposely arranged beforehand that there should be no other visitors at the time of her arrival[1]—the change of air and scene, as well

[1] Burghley writes to Shrewsbury to take care "that for the time she (Mary) shall be there, that all others being strangers from your lordship's company be forbidden to come thither during the time of the queen's abode there."—Lodge, ii. 30.

as the beneficial effects of the spring, wrought a speedy change on the health and spirits of the queen; and she expressed her grateful thanks not only to Elizabeth, but to Burghley and Leicester, for acceding to her wishes.[1] Had she been aware of the purpose for which they had despatched Killigrew to Scotland some months before, her message might have been couched in somewhat different terms.

Shortly before her departure for Buxton, Mary had received a visit from her chancellor, Du Verger, who administered her property in France; and she was even allowed the privilege of conferring with that officer without the presence of her keeper—a favour which she shrewdly suspected was intended to mislead the French Government as to the true nature of her imprisonment.[2] As it was, she took advantage of the presence of her chancellor to renew her request for the services of a priest of her own religion. But upon this point Elizabeth was inexorable. She not only peremptorily refused the request of her sister queen, but she added that she did not believe she was serious in making it, for she had perfect liberty to exercise a much better religion,[3] and with that she ought to be content.

What Elizabeth's real notions of religion were, it is impossible to say. Upon this, as upon most important subjects, she probably never made up her mind. But she had no bigotry in her nature; and when she declared that "she would not dive into consciences," she probably spoke the truth. There was one point only upon which her opinion was unalterably fixed, and that was, that every one should conform, out-

[1] Labanoff, iv. 84. [2] Ibid., 76. [3] Ibid., 95.

wardly at least, to the religion which she herself professed. She did not ask for more; but she would not be satisfied with less—as her cruel persecution both of Papists and Nonconformists subsequently proved.

Mary appears to have derived her notions of religious toleration from her mother; and at a time when no Protestant would enter a Catholic place of worship, she had in Scotland frequently attended the Reformed Kirk, and even listened to the fervid admonitions of Knox. After her arrival in England she had, both at Bolton Castle and at Sheffield, displayed a similar spirit, and had not only listened to the sermons of Anglican divines, but had often discoursed with them in private on religious topics. But the obstinate refusal of her keepers to allow her the exercise of her own religion, and the rude reply of Elizabeth to her last request, induced her finally to abandon her practice of attending the Anglican services. In a letter to Fénelon, she fully explained her reasons for this decision. She said that because she had attended the Protestant services her enemies had alleged that she was not sincere in her religion. But Sir Francis Knollys and Lord Scrope knew that this was a gross calumny, for they had endeavoured to induce her to take what they called the sacrament; but she had never done so, nor had ever even been present when it was administered. She said, further, that while under the charge of the Earl of Shrewsbury she had not only heard a number of different Protestant preachers, but had conversed with them in private, and she never found any two who, on the most cardinal points of the Christian faith, were of the same opinion. Instead, therefore, of converting her to

their religion, they had confirmed her in her own. There were only two things upon which all Protestant preachers agreed—they all abused the Pope, and they all prayed for the queen, which it appeared they were bound by law to do. With these exceptions, there seemed to be amongst them "as many different religions as heads." [1]

From about this time we may observe a gradual change in the religious sentiments of the Scottish queen. We have seen that, on her arrival in Scotland, she had made every effort to conciliate the Reformers. She delegated to them the sole management of public affairs; she allowed them to ruin the chief of the Catholic nobility—the Earl of Huntly; she consented to the establishment of a State provision for the Protestant clergy; and she sought by every means to win the friendship of Elizabeth. On her arrival in England she had evinced a similar spirit; but she had found the Anglican clergy quite as bigoted in their own fashion as the disciples of Knox. Intolerance begets intolerance; and Mary must have been more or less than woman if she could have borne with untiring patience, in addition to her other wrongs and sufferings, the refusal of her keepers to allow her the exercise of her own religion. Need we, then, be astonished that, as years passed away and her hopes of liberty became gradually fainter, she should cling with increasing fervour to the faith of her fathers, and regard with increasing bitterness those who were avowedly seeking its extermination? If Mary finally became a most formidable enemy to Protestantism, we must look for the cause, not to her

[1] Labanoff, iv. 98.

own inclinations, but to the barbarous policy of Cecil. Her imprisonment and outrageous treatment not only impeded the progress of the Reformation in England, but led of necessity to a succession of Catholic conspiracies which kept the kingdom in perpetual alarm. That these results were not foreseen from the first, argues a singular degree of blindness on the part of Burghley and his colleagues; for nothing can be clearer than that every complaint which they made of the dangers incurred through the presence of the Scottish queen in England was simply a confession of their own wickedness and folly.

Mary appears at this time to have laid aside all projects of ambition. In a confidential letter to her ambassador in Paris, she informed him that she now desired nothing but repose and the free exercise of her religion, and that but for the poor Catholics, who had no hope but in her, she would most willingly renounce her crown and everything that she possessed.[1] As it was not in her nature to remain idle, she spent her time chiefly in reading and in needlework, in which it is well known she excelled. It seems to have occurred to her, while thus employed, that some small gift of her own making might not prove unacceptable to Elizabeth. Fénelon was sounded on the subject, and through his friendly intervention various articles of Mary's workmanship were graciously accepted by the English queen. Mary was delighted,[2] and she followed up the experiment

[1] "Je suis en tel estat que je désire avoyr liberté d'aller servir à Dieu en vie privée et quicter tout ce que j'ay, et vous jure mon Dieu que sans la crierie des pauvres catholicques, qui n'ont espoyr qu'en moy, je ne seroys jamais royne ni douairiere."—Labanoff, iv. 180.

[2] "J'ay grandissime satisfaction de ce que me mandés qu'il a pleu a

by sending to her rival occasional presents of millinery and confections, of which she received at this time constant supplies from Paris. In a letter to her uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine, we find her requesting him to send her a mirror of a particular pattern,[1] which she designed as a gift for her cousin; and she at the same time desired her ambassador in Paris to purchase for her any novelty he might think adapted for this purpose.

By these attentions, which were so well received, Mary no doubt hoped to obtain some indulgence on the part of her keepers. But she probably had a still stronger motive for seeking the favour of Elizabeth at this time. She was still cut off from all communication with her son; and whenever she made inquiries respecting him, Shrewsbury invariably assured her he had no news to tell.[2] To keep her in this state of cruel suspense was a most unnecessary aggravation of her imprisonment. Since the accession of Morton to the regency, her fears for the safety of the prince had been redoubled. It does not appear, however, that any increased facilities were afforded for her gaining tidings of her son, whom she had last seen in his nurse's arms at Stirling Castle, and whom she was never to see again.

While Mary was thus seeking to propitiate her cousin with gifts of needlework and Parisian millinery, Elizabeth was once more quietly plotting the murder of her unsuspecting guest. She had determined, no

la Royne, madame ma bonne sœur avoir mes tablettes pour agréable."—Labanoff, iv. 222.

[1] Labanoff, iv. 56.

[2] "Je suis en grande peyne de n'avoir nulles nouvelles de mon filz, et combien que M. de Cherosbery, quand je luy en demande, me dit tousjours qu'il n'en a poinct."—Mary to Fénelon; Labanoff, iv. 99.

doubt by the advice of Burghley, to renew the negotiations with the Scottish regent which had been broken off by the death of Mar; and Killigrew was once more sent to Scotland to ascertain the terms upon which Morton would perform his part in the much-desired tragedy. No heavier charge can be made against Elizabeth and her ministers than the deliberate revival of this atrocious scheme at this particular time. When it was first proposed, there was something to be said in its extenuation. The massacre of the Protestants in France had just taken place; the whole of Britain was in a state of feverish excitement and alarm, and Mary's partisans in Scotland were still in arms. But the panic had now subsided; Mary's adherents were defeated apparently beyond all hope of recovery; and since the capture of Edinburgh Castle, she had not been accused or suspected of any design even to obtain her liberty. Last, and worst of all, she was on much more cordial terms with her sister queen than at any time since her arrival in England.

As on the former occasion, Mary and her friends were kept in profound ignorance of the conspiracy. She had heard about this time that a wretch named Rolson[1] had undertaken to poison her; and she expressed some alarm lest the Earl of Bedford,[2] whom she regarded as one of her worst enemies, should be appointed her keeper. But her friendly correspondence with Elizabeth, and the greater degree of liberty allowed her by Shrewsbury, with whom, although he

[1] Labanoff, iv. 126. Letter to the Archbishop of Glasgow.

[2] "Homme sans foy et religion, et qui se déclare ouvertement mon ennemy."—Ibid. Bedford was always a zealous Protestant; but that he was, as Mary supposed, her avowed enemy, nowhere appears.

was at times harsh and unfeeling, she considered her life secure, disarmed at this time all suspicion of foul play on the part of the English queen and her ministers.

On reaching Scotland, and sounding the regent upon the "great matter," Killigrew found that since his previous visit a decided change had taken place. Morton was now in absolute possession of the government, his enemies were powerless, and he was no longer dependent on Elizabeth. It is true she had made him regent; but political gratitude, rare in any age, was unknown in this, and he refused to rid her of her rival, except on terms far more exorbitant than those he had demanded two years before. The market had risen so much since his last visit, that Killigrew compared the regent to the Sybil of antiquity.[1] The precise terms required are not known, for some of Killigrew's letters have disappeared; but the conditions were such that he believed his mistress would never sanction them. Under these circumstances he requested to be recalled. But he was desired to remain in Scotland, in the hope that the "great matter" might yet be arranged between him and the regent. Killigrew did his utmost; but it was difficult for the most avaricious of men and the most parsimonious of women to come to terms. Morton seems to have demanded a heavy bribe for himself, and pensions for his friends; while Elizabeth, though at this time willing and apparently eager to take her cousin's life, could not make up her mind to pay the cost. But it is certain that, while thus haggling[2] with Morton for

[1] Killigrew to Walsingham, 12th July; Record Office.

[2] See Mary's letters to Fénelon of 15th August and 14th September; Labanoff, iv. 208, 221.

the price of Mary's blood, she readily accepted whatever presents the Scottish queen chose to send her.

In the course of this year, Mary lost her brother-in-law the King of France, and her uncle the Cardinal of Lorraine. The unhappy Charles—as much the victim of his mother's perfidy as Coligni—lamented with his latest breath the Protestant massacre; and the deep remorse which he expressed for the part he had acted in the tragedy, tends much to extenuate his guilt.[1] His brother, the Duke of Anjou, who succeeded him under the title of Henry III., was believed to take a more lively interest in the fortunes of Mary Stewart than any of his family. But upon this, as well as upon other matters, he wholly disappointed public expectation; for his mother speedily acquired over him a degree of influence still greater than that which she had exercised over his brother. She had still another son, the Duke of Alençon, whom Catherine still hoped to see the husband of the Queen of England, although he was but a boy of twenty, and Elizabeth was forty-one.

Shortly after the death of her uncle the cardinal,[2] Mary had the misfortune to lose another of her best friends. In the autumn of 1575, Fénelon, who had resided in England for nearly six years, was recalled, and was succeeded by Castelnau de Mauvissiere, who was believed to be entirely in the interests of the queen-mother, and a strong partisan of the projected English marriage. Mary expressed much distrust of the new ambassador; but she had to acknowledge her

[1] Charles died on the 30th May 1574; see Sismondi, Hist. de Français.

[2] The Cardinal of Lorraine died on the 26th December 1574.

error, for Castelnau eventually did her much good service both in Scotland and in France, although she never appears to have been on the same intimate footing with him as with his predecessor.

About this time a rumour reached England that Bothwell was dead. Mary further learned, from what source we do not know, that before his death he made a formal declaration in presence of the Danish authorities, in which he confessed that he, along with others, had been guilty of Darnley's murder, but that the queen was wholly innocent of that crime. On receiving intelligence of these important facts, Mary immediately desired her ambassador in Paris to send some one to Denmark to ascertain if the statement was true, adding that she would willingly defray all necessary expenses.[1] This, however, for some reason not clearly explained, was not done; and Mary, some months afterwards, stated that she had ascertained that the confession of Bothwell had been transmitted to Elizabeth, and that she had suppressed it.[2] This seems highly probable; for we know that a declaration of some kind was made by Bothwell before his death, and we know that it has disappeared. We know that it was produced as evidence against the Earl of Morton on his trial for the murder of the king some years afterwards; and this fact may throw some light upon a circumstance which has been already mentioned. When Morton was in London in the year 1571, he received a letter from Denmark, which, before showing to Elizabeth, who had expressed a strong desire to see it, he thought proper to falsify.[3] The original might not improbably have contained some allegation of

[1] Labanoff, iv. 334. [2] Ibid., 340. [3] *Ante*, p. 41.

Bothwell against his former accomplice which was concealed from the English queen.

With respect to the suppression of Bothwell's confession by Elizabeth, nothing could be more natural, if, as Mary was led to believe, it contained a declaration of her innocence. It may be said, perhaps, that even if the authenticity of this instrument could be proved, it would be of comparatively little value, for, as a rule, there is no kind of testimony less trustworthy than the confessions of criminals. But it is a strong circumstance in favour of the Scottish queen that she so earnestly desired to bring the document to light. She might have been wholly misinformed as to its real contents; and they must, in any case, have led to fresh investigations. Conscious guilt would have shrunk from all such perils, and have sought to bury in oblivion all matters connected with Darnley's murder.[1]

In this same year a new suitor, of a very different type from Bothwell, appeared for the hand of the Scottish queen. In an age unusually prolific in remarkable men, there was none who, considering the shortness of his career, acquired so great a reputation as Don John of Austria.[2] Destined originally for the Church, the imperial bastard displayed such an invincible aversion to theology that Philip reluctantly allowed him to quit the cloister for the camp. Neither in feature, form, nor character, was there a single point of resemblance between the brothers. The bright blue eye, fair hair,

[1] See Appendix D.

[2] He was born on the 24th of February-1545. His father was the Emperor Charles V., and his mother Barbara Blomberg of Ratisbon, of whom Mr Motley gives an entertaining account in his History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic, iii. 132.

and stalwart frame of Don John betrayed his northern blood; while his insatiable craving for adventure, and lofty spirit, were regarded rather with suspicion than with sympathy by the morose tyrant of the Escurial. But in obedience to his father's wishes, Philip always treated Don John as a member of the imperial family; and the two brothers, though differing so widely in character and temperament, remained throughout their lives, at least to all appearance, on friendly terms.

It was in the wars of Grenada that Don John first became known to fame. But he was soon distinguished on a more conspicuous field; and if, after his great victory at Lepanto, he had sailed directly for the Dardanelles, the Turkish capital must have fallen—perhaps without a blow.[1] But instead of steering to the east, he turned to the south, resolved to carve out a kingdom for himself in Northern Africa. Philip watched the career of the adventurous bastard with mingled pride and jealousy. The kingdom of Tunis, which Don John was labouring to found, appeared to that suspicious monarch somewhat too near his own dominions; and he hailed an opportunity which at this time occurred of employing his brother's restless energies in another quarter. The death of Requesens, who had succeeded Alva in the government of the Netherlands, rendered that important post once more vacant, and throughout all Philip's vast dominions there was no man better fitted for it than Don John. He had every quality to recommend him to popular favour—youth and a handsome person, a most winning address,[2] and

[1] Motley's Dutch Republic, iii. 142.

[2] "Every contemporary chronicler," says Mr Motley—"French, Spanish, Italian, Flemish, Roman—have dwelt upon his personal beauty and the singular fascination of his manner."—Vol. iii. 144.

unrivalled military fame. If the loyalty of the Netherlands to their hereditary sovereigns was not wholly extinguished, it might still be revived by the presence of the hero of Lepanto.

Don John had encountered more difficulties in establishing his African kingdom than he had anticipated, and was not unwilling, on that account, to seek a new field for his ambition. But in accepting the government of the Netherlands he had a secret motive which Philip, with all his boasted skill in kingcraft, did not fathom. If Don John had a weakness, it was his devotion to beauty; and was there not in England at that moment, languishing in prison, the most beautiful princess in the world, and she, too, the rightful heiress of the English crown? Was she not the victim of her tyrannical kinswoman, who was at once a heretic and a usurper? Here, then, was a glorious prize, both for his chivalry and his ambition. He had vanquished the infidels in the East, and he would now reduce to obedience the heretics in the West. He would first restore peace to the Netherlands; he would then transport his victorious legions across the Channel, and, in place of his paltry principality of Tunis, would conquer for himself three kingdoms, with their heiress for his bride. Although we may feel disposed, at this distance of time, to set down the project as a schoolboy's dream, it was not so regarded either by the Pope or by Elizabeth. The one gave his full assent to the scheme; the other was so alarmed at the prospect, that she at length consented to conclude a treaty with the Prince of Orange, by which she engaged to supply him with £100,000 and 5000 troops.[1] She had

[1] But she was to have ample security for the money, and the troops

hitherto aided the insurgents in secret, but she now threw off the mask and prepared openly to espouse their cause. Yet, true to her systematic policy of deception, which had now ceased to deceive even herself, she sent a special envoy to Madrid to assure Philip of her pacific intentions, while she sent another with similar assurances to Don John himself.

On his journey to Brussels, it was necessary for the new viceroy to traverse France; and in that unhappy country the exasperation of the hostile factions showed no symptoms of abatement. The Protestant confederacy at Millaud in the spring of this year had been followed by the establishment of the famous Catholic league, of which the Duke of Guise was the chief promoter, and of which the king eventually placed himself at the head. In the distracted condition of the country, Don John deemed it prudent to travel in disguise, and he reached Paris in the garb of a Moorish slave, attached to the suite of a friend. The Duke of Guise had been apprised of the secret intentions of Don John respecting Mary Stewart; and before quitting France, he had an interview with her kinsman, who seems to have entirely approved of the daring project of the the viceroy.[1] Continuing his journey in the disguise he had assumed, Don John reached Luxembourg on the 3d of November 1576.

Full of his great scheme of invading England and liberating Mary Stewart, Don John made every effort to conciliate the people of the Netherlands; and his rank, his fame, and his fascinating manners, insured

were to be paid by the States.—Motley, Rise of the Dutch Republic, iii. 209.

[1] Brantome, ii. 137, 138.

him everywhere a most flattering reception. Nor did he disappoint public expectation; for, shortly after his arrival, the States-General placed certain demands before him,[1] and, after some discussion, he assented to them all. On the 17th of February 1577, he signed the treaty named "the perpetual edict," by which he stipulated, among other important matters, that all political prisoners should be set at liberty, and that all Spanish and other foreign troops should, as soon as practicable, quit the Netherlands.[2]

Mary had been apprised of the project of Don John by her ambassador in Paris; and had she been the intriguing and vindictive woman described by her enemies, she must not only have hailed with delight the plan of the invasion, but she would certainly have found the means of opening up a correspondence with her adventurous lover. But no letters ever passed between them; and although gratified, no doubt, by the deep interest with which she had inspired the hero of Lepanto, she expressed herself with hesitation, and even with coldness, on his daring and romantic scheme. She had disapproved eight years before of the northern rebellion, and a foreign invasion was a project still more hazardous.[3] In the mean time, she had learned that the pacific measures of Don John had caused much alarm to Elizabeth's ministers, who were becoming apprehensive of an alliance between France and Spain, and to avert this justly dreaded danger,

[1] "It will be seen that everything required by the envoys of the States at the commencement of their negotiations had been conceded by Don John."—Motley, iii. 164.

[2] Motley, *ubi supra*. "The treaty was confirmed by Philip a few weeks afterwards."—Ibid.

[3] Labanoff, iv. 364.

were straining every nerve to stir up fresh troubles in the Netherlands, and to perpetuate the civil war in France. That Mary described with perfect truth the apprehensions of the English Council, we learn from a letter written about the same time by the Earl of Sussex. It was the profound conviction of that able minister that peace in France and in the Netherlands meant war in England, and that it was only by encouraging insurrection abroad that tranquillity could be preserved at home.[1] Such, indeed, were the inevitable results of the meddling policy of Cecil. It was now too late for his mistress to retire from the dangerous game in which, under his guidance, she had engaged. She was bound to persevere or perish.

Every effort was meanwhile made to ascertain if Don John had any active partisans in England. Against the Scottish queen no evidence could be discovered, but she was removed to Chatsworth as a place of greater security than Sheffield Castle; and although she was allowed to revisit Buxton in the autumn of this year, Leicester—whom she always suspected of some sinister design—was sent to watch her, and to draw from her, if possible, some information respecting the projects of Don John. During his stay at Buxton, Leicester did his utmost to impress upon the Scottish queen that, instead of relying upon foreign princes, she ought to place implicit confidence in the friendship of his mistress. But Mary plainly told the earl that his mistress had deceived her so often that she no

[1] "Of the French actions and Flemish troubles, your lordship, I am assured, is better advertised by Mr Secretary than you can be by me, and therefore I do forbear to trouble you therewith. The troubles of both places, when they have been carried on jointly, have certainly bred our quiet," &c.—Sussex to Burghley, 21st August 1577; Lodge, ii. 87.

longer placed any reliance on mere words.[1] Leicester soon discovered that he had made a fruitless errand; and the only result of his visit to Buxton was to excite the jealousy of Burghley,[2] who seems to have thought that on a mission of such delicacy he ought to have been preferred to his more showy colleague. Walsingham was equally unsuccessful. That minister, unrivalled for his skill in detecting and in hatching plots, had sought for evidence in every quarter against the Scottish queen; but, in spite of all his efforts, nothing was found to connect her in any way with the plan of the invasion.

The conditions of the "Perpetual Edict" had been faithfully fulfilled by Don John. But they did not satisfy the patriotism or the ambition of the Prince of Orange. He not only protested on the part of Holland and Zealand against the treaty, but he secretly recommended that Don John should be kidnapped,[3] and detained a prisoner until the independence of the Netherlands was acknowledged. William the Silent was, in short, disappointed and disconcerted by the readiness of his antagonist to come to terms; for while the Prince desired war, the Viceroy—still full of his secret project of invading England—sincerely wished for peace. Don John made every effort to conciliate his adversary; but his advances were repelled with an obstinacy which galled him to the quick, and he gave vent to his feelings in language more befitting the deck of his war-galley than the council-chamber,

[1] Labanoff, iv. 371. [2] Ibid., 370.

[3] Motley's Dutch Republic, iii. 199. It is difficult to reconcile this proposal with the much-vaunted integrity of the Prince of Orange. Kidnapping an enemy in the sixteenth century usually meant something more than depriving him of liberty.

against the stiff-necked prince[1] and all his countrymen. Through the artful policy of Orange, the Viceroy soon found himself in a position of very great peril. He had sent away his troops to Italy in accordance with the treaty; while the States, at the instigation of his adversary, were secretly raising fresh levies, and seeking aid from Germany as well as England. Rumours that he was to be made a prisoner or assassinated reached Don John from various quarters; while Spain was distant, and Philip was distressingly slow in all his resolutions. The prospect of so many dangers roused the Viceroy at last to sudden action. Although he could not contend with William the Silent in the crooked paths of diplomacy, there was another field in which he did not fear to meet him. He took possession, by a stratagem, of the impregnable fortress of Namur; he summoned all loyal Belgians to his standard; he despatched messengers to Lombardy to recall his Spanish veterans with all possible speed, and prepared with stern satisfaction for the conflict which his adversary had forced upon him.[2]

Don John was in his element once more. He proclaimed on his banners[3] that he would vanquish the heretics as he had vanquished the Turks, and he speedily fulfilled the prophecy with terrible exactness. The opposing armies met at Gemblours, well matched in point of numbers, for there were on each side about twenty thousand troops;[4] but never, even

[1] As to the epithets he bestowed upon them, see Motley, part v. ch. ii.

[2] Motley, part v. chap. iv.

[3] "In hoc signo vici Turcos in hoc hereticos vincam." These words were surmounted by a crucifix.

[4] The battle took place on the 31st of January, 1578.

under the invincible Alva, did the men of the Netherlands suffer so crushing a defeat. In a word, their army was annihilated, while Don John sustained no serious loss. It was a repetition upon land of his glorious triumph at Lepanto. The nephew of the Viceroy, Alexander Farnese,[1] Prince of Parma, who had fought by his side against the Turks, and whose fame as a commander was one day to eclipse even that of his illustrious uncle, took a prominent part in the engagement, and contributed essentially to the victory.

The romantic project of Don John could now no longer be derided as an idle dream. Everything seemed possible to his genius and valour; and the Scottish queen and her victorious champion became for the time the two most interesting personages in Christendom. Elizabeth, justly alarmed, despatched Walsingham on a special mission to the Netherlands to watch the progress of events; and even that wary minister, with all his anti-Papist and anti-Spanish prejudices, was charmed with the frank and manly bearing of the Viceroy. "I never saw," he said, "a gentleman for personage, speech, wit, and entertainment comparable to him."[2] It would almost appear that, although the time had now gone by when kingdoms were won by individual prowess, the politic secretary could not divest himself of the notion that Don John might possibly one day become his sovereign. With respect to Mary's sentiments at this time, we are wholly in the dark. She is singularly reticent on the subject of her self-constituted cham-

[1] The successor of Don John in the government of the Netherlands.

[2] Walsingham to Burghley, August 27; Record Office.

pion; nor do we find in her letters a single expression of exultation at his success. Ever averse to violent measures, we may probably conclude that she could not but regard with apprehension the dangers and the miseries of a foreign invasion of England. At a later period, indeed, she was prepared to sanction even that desperate expedient to regain her long-lost liberty; but for the present she was content apparently to watch the current of events in silence.

Don John had followed up his victory by the capture of various important towns; but experience had already shown that the spirit of the people of the Netherlands was not to be broken by military disasters, however great. They had been long accustomed to defeat; and Don John discovered that, in spite of his successes, the prospect of peace was as distant as ever. Instead of being energetically supported by Philip, he was left entirely to his own resources. He was without allies, and without money to pay his troops. His secretary and dearest friend, Escovedo, whom he had sent to Madrid to represent to Philip the true condition of the Netherlands, was treacherously murdered, with the connivance, if not by the orders, of the king; and this atrocity filled Don John with grief and indignation.[1] Distrusted by his brother, and now an object of detestation to the people whom he had sincerely, though vainly, sought to conciliate, he earnestly begged to be allowed to retire from his post. Don John was not one of those iron-hearted warriors who regard their fellow-men with indifference or contempt. He both loved and courted popularity; but the enthusiastic loyalty which had

[1] See Mignet, Antonio Perez et Philippe II.

greeted his arrival in the Netherlands, was everywhere exchanged for disaffection and defiance. The romantic project of invading England and liberating Mary Stewart, which alone had induced him to accept the government, now seemed absolutely hopeless. His ardent and impetuous nature could ill brook such a succession of disappointments; and, thwarted upon every side, he became a prey to melancholy, and even spoke seriously of imitating the example of his father, and retiring to a monastery.[1] While in this despondent state, an attack of fever—the result, apparently, of mental suffering—laid him on his deathbed. At intervals in his delirium, the expiring hero would recall past scenes of strife and glory, and with brightening eye and glowing cheek, cheer on his steel-clad squadrons, as was his custom in the day of battle. As his end approached the delirium subsided, and he expired tranquilly on the anniversary of that week on which he had won his greatest victory. Thus perished, at the early age of thirty-two, the last of the Crusaders, and the last and most distinguished of all the suitors of Mary Stewart.[2]

It is a curious coincidence, that at the very time when Mary was receiving, through her ambassador in Paris, intelligence of the projects of Don John, she should obtain, through the same channel, information from Scotland of a still more unlooked-for kind. That the Regent Morton should at this time seek a reconciliation with the sovereign he had so grievously wronged, and whose life he had so eagerly sought, seems hardly credible; yet such was undoubtedly the case. The

[1] See his correspondence in Motley, part v. chap. v.

[2] Motley, *ubi supra*. Don John died on the 1st of October 1578.

evidence of this remarkable fact, which is new in Scottish history, we shall briefly lay before the reader.

In the spring of 1577, the Lord Ogilvie, who through all her good and evil fortune had remained a faithful adherent of the queen, had an interview at Edinburgh with the regent. Morton began by expressing his great esteem for the Archbishop of Glasgow, the queen's ambassador in Paris; and then, no doubt to the great surprise of Ogilvie, he launched out in a strain of enthusiastic loyalty towards the queen herself. "He would not do her wrong," he said, "nor consent thereto, for all the wealth in the world. . . . He would rather *serve her and her race than any living creature*, as God was his judge. . . . Further, if he was sure that the queen *would forget and put in oblivion things past*, that he would do all things in his power to restore her to her former estate and favour."[1] He cunningly added a piece of information to which, with his experience of her sex, he thought that even a queen would not be indifferent—namely, that he would be able to restore to her the greater portion of her jewels. Mistrusting, apparently, what he had heard, Lord Ogilvie subsequently conferred with Sir James Balfour on the subject. Balfour, who at this time occupied the highest judicial office in Scotland,[2] assured Ogilvie in the strongest terms that the regent was perfectly sincere in his desire to serve the queen, and that he would be quite content to live under her and her son as a private nobleman. Balfour further urged Lord Ogilvie to communicate the regent's mes-

[1] Lord Ogilvie to the Archbishop of Glasgow, April 1577; see Appendix B.

[2] President of the Court of Session.

sage to the Archbishop of Glasgow without delay, and added that, if that prelate could bring about a reconciliation between his mistress and Morton, he would render an inestimable service to his country. Let us pause for a moment before we trace the further history of this extraordinary negotiation.

We have seen that of all Queen Mary's enemies Morton had been beyond comparison the worst. In all the conspiracies against her he had not only taken a leading part, but he had accused her of the most atrocious crimes, and had produced the forged letters of the casket in proof of the accusation. He had since been the most ruthless persecutor of her friends in Scotland, and had listened eagerly to the scheme of Burghley and Leicester for putting her to death. And yet we find this man professing all at once the most profound loyalty and affection for the sovereign he had deposed and foully slandered, and whom, for a sufficient bribe, he had expressed his readiness to murder.

The change of Morton's attitude towards the queen must be explained by the altered state of public feeling towards himself. After the capture of Edinburgh Castle, Morton found himself in a very different position from any of his predecessors. Murray, Lennox, and Mar were engaged in a perpetual struggle with the adherents of the queen, and were only enabled to hold their ground by the powerful aid of Elizabeth. But after the treaty of Perth, and the death of Maitland and Kirkaldy, Morton remained sole master of Scotland; and the people, wearied of anarchy and bloodshed, quietly submitted to a despotism which was at least preferable to civil war. But Morton, who was at no time a favourite with his countrymen, soon

raised up a host of enemies among all classes of the people. To propitiate Elizabeth, he restored the bishops; but to enrich himself, he deprived them of nearly all their revenues.[1] Ever bent on accumulating wealth, he robbed, under various devices, even the ministers of the Kirk of a considerable portion of their slender stipends.[2] He debased the coin of the realm,[3] and he taxed the merchants by obliging them to pay a licence for liberty to trade with foreign countries.[4] He made a mockery of justice by hearing and deciding suits to which he himself was a party;[5] and with such men on the bench as Sir James Balfour and Archibald Douglas, both his accomplices in the murder of Darnley, the courts of law became mere engines for the plunder of the rich and the ruin of the poor. Nor was it of his tyranny and avarice alone that the people complained. Although his language was always that of a devout Reformer, he was, like the Puritanical Leicester, notoriously profligate in private life;[6] and

[1] Tytler, vii. 337.
[2] Robertson, b. vi. 372.
[3] Robertson, ibid., and note.
[4] Tytler, viii. 5.
[5] Historie of King James the Sext, 259.
[6] On the 15th of February 1574, Fénelon writes: "Les choses semblent être en paix en Ecosse sous la prétendue regence de Morton, bien que j'aie avis qu'il s'y déporte en homme avare, violent et dissolu; et de tous les principaux de la noblesse, il n'a pres de lui a cette heure, qu'un seul milord dant il entretient la femme, et en entretien encore deux ou trois autres mariées, au grand scandale d'un chacun;" t. iv. 32. Morton was never married, but he had several illegitimate sons; and with reference to them the following entries are to be found in the "Registry of Presentations," preserved in the Register House, Edinburgh:—

"Confirmation of pension, by William Bishop of Aberdeen, of £500, to Archibald Douglas, son natural of the regent."—Dated 14th April 1574.

"Confirmation of pension, by Henry Commendator of Balmerino, of £500, to James Douglas, son natural of the regent."—Dated 26th December 1576.

"Confirmation of pension, by Robert Bishop of Caithness, of £500, to

it was not a fortunate circumstance for the reputation of the new creed that two such men should at this time have been its most prominent supporters in Great Britain.

Notwithstanding his great unpopularity, Morton held his ground for several years; but all his efforts failed to extinguish the loyalty which was still entertained by a large section of the people towards the queen, and who could not fail to contrast her mild rule with the corrupt tyranny of the regent. His experienced eye saw clearly that his power was waning; he knew that he had made innumerable enemies, and that an effort would be made to overthrow him as soon as they acquired sufficient strength. Upon Elizabeth he knew that no reliance could be placed in the hour of need; and to shield him from the storm which he saw approaching, and to enable him to preserve the immense wealth he had accumulated, he resolved to seek the aid of the sovereign he had betrayed. Maitland had gone over to her side in the belief that the tide was turning in her favour. Was Morton of the same opinion now when he thus made proffer of his services, and begged her "to forget the past"? It is impossible to answer the question with certainty; but if he was not sincere, it is difficult to see what motive he could have had in making such advances at this time to the queen.

Lord Ogilvie, in accordance with the advice of Balfour, lost no time in acquainting the Archbishop of Glasgow with the overtures of Morton; but many weeks elapsed before intelligence of the fact reached

[1] George Douglas, son natural to the regent."—Dated 26th December 1576.

Mary at Sheffield Castle. At first she seems to have regarded the proposals of the regent with strong suspicion, and even conjectured that Walsingham might have some hand in the matter. But, upon second thoughts, she deemed it not improbable that Morton, conscious of the wicked part he had acted towards her, and dreading the prospective vengeance of her son, might seek to shield himself against the consequences of his misdeeds. Yet she instinctively recoiled from all correspondence with a man whom she could not but regard with abhorrence; and all circumstances considered, she simply desired her ambassador in Paris to take, for the present, no notice of the matter further than to thank Lord Ogilvie in her name for the zeal he had all along exhibited in her service.[1]

The question naturally arises, If Morton had been himself conscious of innocence, and convinced of the charges he had made against the queen, would he at this time have begged her to forget "the past," and made so pressing an offer of his services? Would she on the other hand, if conscious of guilt, have hesitated for a moment to accept them? But assuming that Morton was guilty and the queen was innocent, nothing could be more natural than the conduct of both. He sought to win back her favour to screen him from the vengeance of his enemies; and she, though a helpless prisoner, pining for liberty and ready to make the greatest sacrifices to obtain it, shrank from the proffered friendship of the man who, in spite of his fine words, she knew to be the most unscrupulous of all her enemies.

[1] Labanoff, iv. 384, 385.

The storm which Morton had seen for some time gathering, broke out at last in the shape of a conspiracy, of which the Earls of Atholl and Argyll[1] were the chiefs. Atholl, who was a Stewart, and a kinsman of Darnley, had never been on friendly terms with the regent, and between Argyll and Morton a dispute had arisen of a very acrimonious kind. Argyll had married the widow of the Regent Murray; and we have seen that, in spite of the queen's remonstrances,[2] that lady had kept possession of the royal jewels, of which, by a flagrant breach of trust,[3] her husband had obtained possession. But the Regent Morton had quite as keen an eye for plunder as his predecessor; and, although the countess had been allowed to keep the jewels during the regencies of Lennox and Mar, Morton now claimed them as the property of the Crown. After an angry correspondence they were delivered up, but not until after Argyll had been threatened with arrest.[3] Accompanied by Atholl he shortly afterwards repaired to Stirling in the absence of Morton, and, after complaining of his tyranny and extortions, besought the young king—who was now in his twelfth year—to summon a Parliament for the purpose of depriving the regent of his authority. They had gained over the king's tutor, George Buchanan,[4] who now turned against his patron Morton, as he had formerly turned against the queen; and the regent, perceiving that he was unable for the present to make head against his enemies, forthwith resigned his office and retired to the island stronghold of Lochleven. In this retreat he betook himself to gardening and fishing

[1] Tytler, viii. 20. [2] *Ante*, vol. i. 514.
[3] *Ante*, vol. i. 376. [4] Tytler, viii. 23. [5] Ibid., viii. 27.

—happy, to all appearance, to be relieved from the cares and the turmoil of public life.[1]

But those peaceful occupations, which were only intended to deceive his enemies, were speedily abandoned. On his resignation of the regency, twelve noblemen had been named as a permanent council to the king. Atholl was shortly afterwards appointed Chancellor,[2] and he and Argyll assumed the chief direction of affairs. But during their absence in Edinburgh, Morton suddenly made his appearance in Stirling, and with the connivance of the young Earl of Mar—who had married his niece[3]—made a prisoner of the king, and, summoning to his aid his nephew the Earl of Angus and the numerous vassals of the house of Douglas, prepared to meet his adversaries in the field. Atholl and Argyll assembled their followers with equal speed; and the opposing armies, numbering from six to seven thousand men on each side, met at Falkirk on the 13th of August. There had already been some skirmishing in front, when the English ambassador, Sir Robert Bowes, who had been sent by Elizabeth to watch the progress of events, and to protect Morton as far as was practicable, persuaded the leaders upon both sides to consent to a truce.[4] The result was a reconciliation, which redoubled the rancour of the rival chiefs; and within a few months, Atholl, the Chancellor, after partaking of an entertainment given by Morton, died of poison.[5] As Atholl

[1] Spottiswoode, ii. 222; Melvill, Memoirs, 126.

[2] He succeeded Lord Glammis, who had been killed in a fray between his retainers and those of the Earl of Crawford.—Tytler, viii. 29.

[3] A sister of the Earl of Angus.

[4] See letter of Lord Hunsdon to Burghley, August 19, 1578, in Appendix to Tytler, viii., No. 2.

[5] Atholl died at Kincardine Castle, a seat of the Earl of Montrose, on

had notoriously taken the most prominent part in the movement which led to the overthrow of Morton, suspicion naturally lighted upon him. But in the absence of direct proof, he soon regained his former ascendancy. He did not seek to be restored to the regency, but was apparently contented to take his place as one of the twelve councillors of the king. But the veteran intriguer, by bribes or threats, was ever able to bend his colleagues to his will; and the first use he made of his restored authority was to wreak his vengeance on the Hamiltons.

The Duke of Chatelherault was now dead; his eldest son, the Earl of Arran, the once favoured suitor of Elizabeth, was hopelessly insane; and the family was at this time represented by his two younger brothers —the Lords John and Claud Hamilton. Lord John, as representing his father and his brothers, had signed the treaty of Perth, by which their lands were secured against forfeiture. But, in deliberate breach of this convention, which was now upwards of six years old, Morton proceeded to seize their estates, the most valuable of which adjoined the possessions of his nephew, the Earl of Angus, in Clydesdale. The castle of Hamilton was attacked and taken by Morton, and its chief defenders put to death. Draffen, another stronghold of the family, to which the Duchess of Chatelherault had fled for refuge with the unfortunate Arran, was afterwards besieged and taken, and both mother and son treated with great barbarity. Lord John, after witnessing the ruin of his house, made his escape

the 25th April 1579. A *post-mortem* examination of the body clearly proved that he had been poisoned; but no evidence was as yet discovered as to the perpetrator of the crime.—See Tytler, viii., Appendix No. 4.

with difficulty to Flanders; and Lord Claud fled to England, and sought the protection of Elizabeth.[1] It must be admitted that she was in general culpably indifferent to human suffering. Imbued with all the prejudices of her age and station, her sympathies could only be touched by the misfortunes of the great. The Hamiltons, though not of royal rank, were, after Mary and her son, next in succession to the Scottish crown. Elizabeth had been at one time recommended by her chief minister to ally herself to the representative of this house,[2] and she perhaps regarded its overthrow by Morton in some sense as a slight upon herself. But whether actuated by this or by more worthy motives, she certainly disapproved in this instance of his tyranny and cruelty; and she even sent a special envoy to Scotland[3] to intercede on behalf of the Duchess of Chatelherault and her unhappy son. Morton turned a deaf ear to the remonstrances of the English queen. Nor is it easy to explain why he should have displayed, at this time, so rancorous a spirit against the Hamiltons, unless the rejection of his advances by Mary led him to vent his wrath and disappointment on her most prominent supporters in Scotland.

Considering his treachery and violence, and the unruly nature of his countrymen, Morton maintained his ascendancy in Scotland much longer than might have been expected; but retribution came at last, and from a very unexpected quarter.

[1] Tytler, viii. 45, 46, and the authorities there cited. According to Spottiswoode, ii. 264, Lord John travelled through a great part of England on foot, disguised as a sailor, before he went abroad.

[2] See *ante*, vol. i. 56.

[3] Nicholas Arrington. See his letter to Burghley, printed in Tytler, viii., Appendix 3.

In the autumn of 1579, there arrived in Edinburgh a young stranger[1] of high rank, who was received with every mark of favour at the Scottish court. He was a nephew of the Regent Lennox, and had been born and bred in France, where one of his ancestors had been created Lord of Aubigny,[2] on account of his distinguished military services in the reign of Charles VIII. Esmé Stewart, who at this time bore the title, had repaired to Scotland professedly to recover the Lennox estates, which, by the rules of descent, belonged to his cousin, the young king. But James, whose strong propensity to favouritism had already begun to exhibit itself, displayed excessive partiality for his kinsman, and as soon as the necessary formalities could be completed, bestowed upon him both the lands and the earldom of Lennox, together with the custody of Dumbarton Castle, which was situated in the district of that name. The favours thus showered upon the young stranger naturally aroused the jealousy of Morton and his friends; and it was soon whispered abroad that Aubigny was an emissary of the Jesuits and the Princes of Lorraine, and that he had been sent to Scotland for the purpose of subverting the true religion, and of reviving the old alliance with France. That these rumours were substantially true, we have every reason to believe; for although, to silence his enemies,[3] Aubigny took the extraordinary step of publicly renouncing the Catholic faith, and declaring himself a convert to Protestantism, we know that he

[1] Mr Froude says that he was only twenty-three; vol. xi. 266. But he must have been older, for he had at this time a son ten years old.

[2] He commanded a French army in Calabria in 1493. See Guicciardini, vol. i. 290, who calls him "Obigni."

[3] Bowes to Burghley and Walsingham.—Cotton MSS., Calig. c. vi. 31.

subsequently became the acknowledged agent of the King of Spain and the Duke of Guise, and did his utmost to promote their ambitious designs upon Britain.

The presence of Aubigny at the Scottish court was regarded with much uneasiness by Elizabeth, and Sir Robert Bowes was sent to Edinburgh to reconnoitre and report. The chief duty of watching the politics of Scotland devolved, at this time, upon Walsingham, who, with all the industry and vigilance of Burghley, was much more prompt and vigorous in action, and still less scrupulous in the execution of his designs. This energetic minister quickly made up his mind as to the mode of dealing with Aubigny. He believed, or professed to believe, that the Frenchified Scot was the enemy of England, and that the only safe policy of Elizabeth was to support Morton against him. Bowes was specially instructed to gain over the clergy; but to their infinite credit, in this most corrupt age, only one of them [1] could be induced to accept a bribe. As a body, these men had many faults, but avarice was not one of them; and, impoverished though they had been by the rapacity of Morton, the independence they displayed on this occasion affords a striking and instructive contrast to the insatiable greed of their noble patrons. There was another man in Scotland whom Bowes found to be incorruptible, and whose name, on that account, deserves to be remembered. Peter Young, who, jointly with Buchanan, had been employed as preceptor of the prince, rejected all the offers of the Eng-

[1] "Mr Peter Young, the king's tutor, or any of the ministry (except one in the king's house, and a reader) *will not receive anything, by any means I can use;* and nevertheless they have been, and are, good instruments to advance the best effects in their power," &c.—Bowes to Walsingham, 3d June 1580; Bowes' Correspondence, 78.

lish envoy.[1] That Buchanan ever refused a bribe no one has asserted.

But it was on Morton that Bowes mainly relied for effecting the purpose he had in view; and the ex-regent was quite prepared, for an adequate consideration, to adopt any scheme for the overthrow of Lennox. Though hated by the mass of the nobility, as well as by the people, Morton could still, through his numerous kinsmen of the house of Douglas, command a powerful body of adherents; and after some months of secret negotiation, the plan of operations was finally agreed upon.

Walsingham was all along prepared to take the most decided measures. Elizabeth was irresolute, as usual; but she at length—and, we may presume, with much misgiving—allowed her secretary to sanction in her name a plot for the assassination of Lennox[2] and the imprisonment of the young king. But no sooner had Walsingham overcome her scruples than she began to

[1] Bowes' Correspondence; Ibid.

[2] Walsingham desires Bowes, in the name of their mistress, to "confer with the Earl of Morton, and other the enemies to the Earl of Lennox, how this matter may be helped either *by laying violent hands on the said earl* and his principal associates, in case no other more temperate course may be found for the remedy thereof, or by some other way that by him shall be thought meet, wherein her majesty willeth you to assure them that they shall not lack any assistance she can give them."—August 31, 1580; Bowes' Correspondence, p. 111.

On the following day Walsingham informs Bowes that her majesty has changed her mind, and he is therefore "to forbear to enter into conference with any of them of any force to be used, or promise of assistance from her majesty, until such time as she shall be advertised by you from thence of the necessity thereof," &c.—September 1, 1580, p. 111.

Walsingham adds in "a postscript:" "You may perceive by this last resolution, in revoking some part of the former direction, how uncertain we are in the course of our doings." And he concludes with this caution to Bowes: "Be not hasty to promise much from hence, for we take no care to perform."—Ibid., p. 112.

tremble for the consequences; and on the very next day, to his infinite disappointment, she recalled the order, and desired Bowes to proceed by way of "persuasion," instead of resorting to violence. But that Elizabeth thus suddenly changed her mind, a repetition of the Riccio tragedy must in all probability have been the result.

There was, in fact, a striking resemblance between the plots, but with this distinction, that the conspiracy against Riccio was watched with silent approval by Elizabeth and her ministers, while they deliberately planned and instigated the destruction of Aubigny. There were other points of similarity between the plots. Both Riccio and Aubigny were foreigners; both were supposed to represent the Papal power and policy in Scotland; the leading conspirator against both was the Earl of Morton, and after his victims were disposed of, it was in each case intended to make a prisoner of the sovereign. There was a still further resemblance between the two conspiracies, for both were defeated—the one by the courage of Mary, and the other by the vacillation of Elizabeth.

But her ministers were still resolved upon the overthrow of Lennox; and as she would not sanction assassination, it became necessary to adopt another course. Bowes was accordingly instructed to seek an interview with the young king and his Council, and to represent to them in the strongest language that the presence of Lennox in Scotland was fraught with imminent danger to both kingdoms. The English envoy was informed, in reply, that the king and his Council were prepared to hear any charges he had to make against Aubigny. But Bowes, to the surprise of every one, explained

that he could only make his accusations in the absence of Lennox. We may conclude from this circumstance that his enemies possessed no proofs of his alleged complicity with the Jesuits; and the extraordinary and offensive nature of the demand led to some sharp correspondence between the English envoy and the Council. The former declared that his instructions were peremptory; the latter finally decided that his request, being contrary to all precedent, and opposed to the first principles of justice, could on no account be complied with.[1] On receiving this reply, Bowes, in accordance with his instructions, quitted Scotland.[2]

The position of Morton now became precarious in the extreme. His intrigues with Bowes had been discovered; and Bowes, apparently by the instructions of his mistress, had left him to his fate. His enemies had in their hands abundant evidence to convict him of his treasonable designs against the king. But they preferred to proceed against him on a still graver charge—namely, the murder of the king's father at the Kirk-of-Field, a crime of which Morton had been all along suspected, but of which fresh proofs had recently come to light.

That the murderers of Darnley should eventually fall out among themselves, and each accuse his accomplices of the crime, was naturally to be expected. We find, accordingly, that Sir James Balfour, who was at this time in France, had become the mortal enemy of the ex-regent, in the belief, no doubt, that by contributing to the fall of his old accomplice he would

[1] Bowes to Lord Burghley, 13th Sept. 1580; Bowes' Correspondence, p. 116.

[2] Ibid., same to same, of 18th Oct., p. 145.

best provide for his own security. It was known that Balfour had prepared the band for the murder of the king. It was believed that the document was still in existence;[1] but as it was not produced, we may probably assume that this was not the case.[2] But Balfour could in many other ways afford essential service to the enemies of Morton, and this he no doubt did to the utmost of his power.

Morton perceived clearly enough the danger in which he stood; and even before the departure of Bowes from Scotland, it was whispered that the ex-regent was about to retire to Germany on the plea of ill health, and to carry with him the enormous fortune he had amassed by the plunder of his country. The Regent Murray had died the richest man in Scotland, but his wealth did not nearly equal that of Morton, who was said to have accumulated bullion to the amount of five or six hundred thousand crowns.[3] The difficulty of sending abroad such an amount of treasure may have induced him to abandon his scheme of leaving Scotland. It is probable that the most avaricious of men preferred to brave the vengeance of his enemies to the loss of that wealth which he had acquired by innumerable crimes.

There was at this time at the Scottish court a young man named James Stewart, who undertook

[1] Queen Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow; Labanoff, v. 189. See also a letter from Randolph to Lords Hunsdon and Huntingdon, dated 16th March 1581, in which he says: "I spoke again of the *band in the green box*, containing the names of all the chief persons consenting to the king's murder, which Sir James either hath or can tell of."—Printed in Tytler, Appendix to vol. viii., No. 7.

[2] According to Drury, it was destroyed by Maitland.—See Tytler, vii. 168.

[3] Castelnau to the King of France; Teulet, iii. 66.

the perilous task of accusing Morton of the murder of the king. Stewart, who was a younger son of Lord Ochiltree, and consequently a brother-in-law of Knox, had served as a soldier of fortune in France, in Denmark, and even in Russia,[1] and was known to be a man of a resolute and daring spirit. He subsequently became conspicuous for other qualities, and acted a very prominent part in Scottish history. At the present time, though in high favour both with Lennox and the king, he only held the post of captain in the royal guard; but the result showed that the enemies of Morton had selected an instrument in all respects well fitted to their purpose.

On the last day of the year, a Council was held at Holyrood in presence of the king. Morton, though recently warned of his danger, had taken his seat as usual, when Captain Stewart requested an immediate audience. On being admitted to the Council-chamber, he fell on his knees before the king, declaring that his duty to his sovereign had brought him thither to reveal a crime that had been too long concealed; then pointing to Morton, he formally accused him of the murder of the king's father, and demanded that he should be forthwith arrested.

Courage was the one redeeming quality of Morton, and to the startling charge of Stewart he replied with contemptuous composure. He said he knew not whose tool his accuser was, and though he might well decline to notice a charge preferred by one so mean in station, he was quite prepared to answer it. It was notorious, he continued, that he had punished

[1] See letter of Sir Edward Hoby to Lord Burghley, Aug. 15, 1584; Record Office and Melvill's Memoirs.

with the utmost rigour every one guilty of Darnley's death. "It is false," retorted Stewart, fiercely: "Where have you placed your cousin Archibald Douglas? Does not that most infamous of men now pollute the bench of justice with his presence, instead of suffering the penalty due to the murderer of his sovereign?" [1]

Stewart sprang to his feet as he uttered these words, and Morton grasped his sword. A personal encounter must have taken place in the Council-chamber had not Lords Lindsay and Cathcart thrown themselves between the antagonists, and both were immediately removed. The justice-clerk, who was present, then declared that on a charge of treason the accused must be committed to prison forthwith; and Morton, after a short detention in Edinburgh, was conveyed under a strong escort to Dumbarton Castle, of which his enemy Lennox was the governor. Immediately after the scene in the Council-chamber, an order was issued for the arrest of Archibald Douglas; but, more fortunate than his kinsman, he eluded the vengeance of his enemies by a hasty flight to England.[2]

An interval of five months elapsed between the arrest and the trial of Morton, during which time the people of Scotland evinced the most profound indifference to his fate. But it was far different in England. To support Morton at all hazards had long been a fixed maxim of policy with the English Council, and an agent more active and unscrupulous than Bowes was despatched to Edinburgh, to effect, if possible, the liberation of the ex-regent, or at all events to save his life. On arriving in Edinburgh, Randolph, who was

[1] Spottiswoode, ii. 271. [2] Tytler, viii. 70.

selected for the purpose, had an interview with the young king, and by alternate flattery and threats sought to convince him of the dangerous projects of Lennox. But James, with becoming spirit, replied that Lennox was his nearest kinsman, and that the charges which Randolph had been instructed to make against him were false and slanderous. As for Morton, he had been accused in the most public manner of the murder of his sovereign; and for that crime he should have been brought immediately to trial but for the absence of a most material witness, Archibald Douglas, who had fled to England, and whom the English queen refused to deliver up.[1]

Elizabeth, meanwhile, spoke in lofty tones of her determination to save Morton at all risks; and Walsingham declared that if a hair of the ex-regent's head were touched, it would cost the Queen of Scots her life.[2] Lord Hunsdon, Leicester, and even the wary Burghley, expressed themselves in language no less strong; and the Earl of Huntingdon, with a considerable force, was ordered to approach the Borders. But the threat of an English invasion added immensely to the influence of Lennox and his friends. Nobles, commons, and clergy were all united in their determination to maintain the independence of their country against their ancient enemies; and a Parliament was summoned to vote the necessary supplies for the war which seemed inevitable.[3]

We have already mentioned[4] that in Scotland the representatives of the three Estates all sat in one

[1] Record Office; King of Scots' answer to Mr Randolph, Feb. 7, 1581.
[2] Ibid.; Walsingham to Randolph, Feb. 9, 1581.
[3] Tytler, viii. 74.
[4] *Ante*, vol. i. 3.

chamber; and having failed to move the king, Randolph now appeared before this assembly, and, after the manner of ambassadors among the nations of antiquity, made a formal harangue in favour of the Earl of Morton. The representative of Elizabeth reminded his audience of the many benefits which his mistress had conferred upon Scotland, in return for all which she had never sought a foot of territory. He then denounced Lennox as an emissary of the Pope, and he produced some intercepted letters, as he alleged, from the Bishop of Ross, in proof of the charge. Lennox, who was present, indignantly declared that the letters produced were forged. For two hours, notwithstanding this interruption, Randolph laboured to convince the Parliament of the friendly intentions of his mistress, and of the necessity of sparing Morton. But the character of the ex-regent was now too well known in Scotland to inspire confidence in any one, and the supplies that were deemed necessary for the war were voted without a dissentient voice.[1]

Baffled in his attempts both upon the king and the Parliament, Randolph did not despair of success. He was authorised, if persuasion failed, to resort to force; in other words, to revive the scheme of Walsingham for making away with Lennox, imprisoning the king, and restoring Morton to liberty and power. To this wicked plot Elizabeth had at length been induced to give her sanction, and Randolph was soon immersed in the congenial work of collecting conspirators for the "surprise" of Lennox and the capture of the king.[2]

[1] Record Office; Randolph's negotiations in Scotland.

[2] Memorial for Secret Objects; Caligula, c. vi. 104, 106.

It is worthy of note that there was one English nobleman of the highest rank who protested, in the most emphatic terms, against the treacherous scheme of Walsingham. The Earl of Huntingdon, at this time president of the Council of the north, although a determined enemy of the Papists, pronounced the conspiracy against Lennox to be neither more nor less than "murder."[1]

Meanwhile Randolph discovered that the enterprise in which he had embarked was one of exceeding danger. There were only two of the leading nobles upon whom he could rely, Angus and Mar—the one related by blood, the other by marriage, to Morton. The great majority of the nobility—Protestant as well as Catholic—were declared partisans of Lennox ; for, strange to say, the rise of the favourite inspired no jealousy except in Morton and his friends. But the conspirators, spurred on by Randolph, finally decided that Lennox, along with Argyll and Montrose, should be murdered, and that the young king should be sent to England under the care of Lord Hunsdon, who had a force in readiness to receive the prince as soon as the plot was executed. But the unexpected arrest of Douglas of Whittingham brought the whole affair to light. This man, under whose roof it is said that the plan for Darnley's murder had been arranged, confessed that his brother, the notorious Archibald Douglas, had forged the letters[2] which were alleged to have been written by the Bishop of Ross to Lennox, and which were produced by Randolph in the Scottish Parliament. Other witnesses gave evi-

[1] Huntingdon to Randolph ; Record Office, March 21, 1581.

[2] See proofs and illustrations, Nos. 6 and 7, appended to Tytler, viii.

dence of the complicity of the English envoy; and such was the indignation excited against him, that a shot was fired at him one evening through the window of his lodgings.[1] Randolph took the hint, and for the third time in his diplomatic career was compelled to make a hasty retreat to Berwick, in consequence of the discovery of his scandalous intrigues.

That he had produced forged letters for the purpose of effecting the ruin of Lennox, and that the forger was Archibald Douglas, are facts beyond dispute; for they are admitted by Sir Robert Bowes in a letter to Walsingham.[2] This incident not only serves to illustrate the political morality of the age, but it may lead us to suspect that Archibald Douglas was concerned in a still more notorious forgery. We know that he was one of Darnley's murderers; and if he could forge letters from the Archbishop of Glasgow to Lennox, might he not have forged, or helped to forge, the letters of Queen Mary to Bothwell? To come to any positive conclusion upon such evidence would be absurd. But we have here an acknowledged adept in the art of forgery who was also one of Darnley's murderers, and who, we may assume, was ready, if occasion offered, to avert suspicion from himself and his accomplices by accusing others of the crime.

The discredit which Randolph had brought on the diplomacy of Elizabeth probably now induced her to

[1] Randolph to Walsingham; Record Office, 25th March 1581.

[2] "I am done to understand that Whitynghame, amonges many other matters, hath affirmed that Mr Archibald Douglas, his brother, had devised, and with his owen hande drawen, the letter and effectes lately alledged by Mr Randolphe before the kynge, and caused to have been sent by the Bishope of Glasgoe to the Pope, and which was afterwards intercepted and brought to her majestie," &c.— Bowes' Papers, 174; 25th March, 1581. See also letter from Lord Ogilvie, Appendix B.

refrain from further interference on behalf of Morton. His accusers proceeded to collect the necessary evidence against him; and while they were thus engaged, fresh and important facts were brought to light. He had all along been strongly suspected of the murder of the Earl of Atholl, and it was at this time ascertained that the person who had been employed to purchase the poison had fled to France. From the fact that a safe-conduct was sent to this man to induce him to return to Scotland, with a promise that no evidence which he might give should be used against him, we may conclude that it was the intention of Morton's enemies to charge him with the murder of Atholl, as well as with that of the king.[1] But, from some unexplained cause, this material witness did not return to Scotland, at least in time for Morton's trial, and it was determined to arraign the ex-regent solely on the charge of treason.

The prodigality with which the Stewarts bestowed their favours contrasted strongly with the parsimony of the Tudors. The rise of Lennox to wealth and power had been singularly rapid; but the rise of his namesake, Captain Stewart, was more rapid still. The latter, being a younger son, was without either feudal rank or fortune; but the courage and address he had displayed in accusing Morton received a speedy and splendid reward. The unfortunate Arran having died about this time, very probably through the barbarous treatment to which he was subjected, Stewart immediately received a grant of that ancient earldom.[2] He at the same time obtained a commission to proceed to Dumbarton Castle, and to bring Morton to Edin-

[1] See the letter of Lennox, Appendix B. [2] Spottiswoode, ii. 276.

burgh, where it was arranged that his trial should take place.[1]

Morton had borne his reverse of fortune with dignity and resignation. In his prison on Dumbarton rock he had spent his time chiefly in reading the Scriptures, and he spoke with becoming sorrow and contrition of his past misdeeds. His trial and confession have already been referred to in a former part of this work,[2] but we may add that he solemnly denied that he was guilty of the poisoning of Atholl. He denied that he had ever meditated treason against the prince; and he declared, before mounting the scaffold, that if he had served his God as faithfully as he had served his king, he should never have been brought to such a pass.[3]

That Morton possessed great abilities is not to be disputed; nor can it be denied that the corrupt tyranny which he established in Scotland was far preferable to the anarchy which previously prevailed. In spite of his exactions the country prospered, for it was at peace. During his regency, and even till the time of his death, the people were not distracted either by foreign or internal war; and the progress

[1] Spottiswoode, ii. 276. [2] Vol. i. 261.

[3] The words of Morton, according to a contemporary chronicler, were as follows: "Gif I had bene als cairfull to serve my God and walk in His feir, as I was to see the kingis weill, I had nocht bene brocht to this poynt that I am at this day."—Bannatyne, Memorials, 320. It is curious that Ruthven, who, like his friend the ex-regent, ended his days on a scaffold three years afterwards, expressed himself in nearly similar terms: "If he had been as careful to advance God's glory, as he was towards the king's estate, he had not suffered that day."—Bannatyne, Miscellany, i. 103. The sentiment expressed by both is identical with that which George Cavendish, in his Life of Wolsey, has put into the mouth of the dying cardinal, and which Shakespeare has immortalised.

which they made in this interval excited the surprise, and perhaps the jealousy, of their southern neighbours.[1] But for these results no credit can attach to Morton; for if the country prospered, it was not in consequence, but in spite of his absurd restrictions upon its commerce, his tampering with the coin,[2] and his iniquitous interference with the administration of the law. It has been said in his praise that, from first to last, he was steadfast to the English alliance;[3] but his secret overtures to Mary may convince us that private interest was his only guide on this as on every other occasion throughout his long and stormy career.

Upon hearing of the arrest of Morton, Mary was filled with apprehension respecting her son, whom she said she valued more than "a hundred kingdoms of Scotland."[4] She was fully impressed with the belief that Elizabeth would send an army to Scotland for the rescue of the ex-regent, and that in the struggle which must ensue the prince would be exposed to imminent danger. She therefore desired her ambassador in Paris to take immediate steps for having him, if possible, removed to France. She further complained, with pardonable bitterness, of the interest which Elizabeth took in the fate of a notorious murderer; while she secretly accused her and the

[1] See letters of Killigrew to Walsingham of 18th, 23d, and 24th June 1574; Record Office.

[2] According to Robertson, ii. 371, note, "Morton mixed a fourth part of alloy with every pound of silver, and sunk by consequence the value of coin in proportion. In the year 1581 all the money coined by him was called in, and appointed to be recoined: the standard was restored to the same purity as formerly."

[3] "His one virtue was his fidelity to England."—Froude, xi. 292.

[4] Mary Stewart to the Archbishop of Glasgow; Labanoff, v. 189.

Hamiltons of a crime of which she well knew they were wholly innocent.[1]

Walsingham had boasted that the sacrifice of Morton would cost the Queen of Scots her head; and it appears that this was not an idle threat. After the death of the ex-regent, Elizabeth and her ministers held various consultations as to the disposal of the Scottish queen. That Burghley and a majority of his colleagues would have readily consented to her death at this time, and that they took advantage of the alarm and irritation of their mistress to urge upon her the necessity of taking decided steps against her prisoner, we have abundant proof. But although justly alarmed at the threatening aspect of affairs both in Scotland and abroad, Elizabeth could not make up her mind to act on the advice of her ministers. She hesitated, as usual, from day to day; and the Council finally broke up without coming to any definite conclusion.[2]

[1] Mary Stewart to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 12th January; Labanoff, v. 189. There is not the slightest proof that the Hamiltons were concerned in Darnley's murder, beyond the assertion of Buchanan.

[2] We learn from a letter of Burghley written at this time that he and his colleagues desired to bring the Scottish queen to trial, upon what charge we are not informed; but if Elizabeth had given her consent, abundant evidence would no doubt have been forthcoming. Burghley thus describes the strange state of perplexity into which his mistress was thrown by the discussions in the Council, which had lasted three days, and during which she had been as variable as the weather. For he adds: "Her majesty would come to no determination on any one point; so they left off talking from weariness, and the queen had postponed all till some future time. They were long deliberating to what place the Scottish queen should be brought, where she and her causes might be heard. The *Tower* was rejected. The Council then unanimously recommended *Hertford Castle*, which the queen consented to *for one whole day*, and then changed her mind, saying it was too near London. Then *Fotheringay* was mentioned, which she said was too far off. Then *Grafton*, *Woodstock*, *Northampton*, *Coventry*, and *Huntingdon*, all of which were rejected, either for want of strength or conveniency," &c.—Burghley to Walsingham, 10th Sept. 1581; printed in Chalmers, ii. 89.

CHAPTER XXI.

PERSECUTIONS AND PLOTS IN ENGLAND; FRESH TROUBLES IN SCOTLAND.

THE history of religious persecution presents everywhere the same characteristic features. Whenever a dominant sect seeks to extend its doctrines or to extinguish its adversaries by force, we have the same scenes of ruthless violence on the one side, and of heroic endurance on the other. The persecution of the Catholics under Elizabeth, although less rigorous than that of the Protestants under her sister Mary, was of a more systematic and enduring kind, and led to results far more important. Although during the reign of the last of the Tudors the stake and the fagot ceased to be employed[1] as instruments of punishment, a variety of highly penal statutes placed the fortune, and even the life, of every Catholic at the mercy of the civil power. As the kingdom swarmed with informers and spies of every grade in society, evidence was never wanting when a victim was required; and in the year 1580, the sufferings of those who still adhered to the

[1] It does not appear that any Catholics suffered death by burning in the reign of Elizabeth. But various Nonconformists were sent to the stake. In the year 1579, several Anabaptists were committed to the flames in Smithfield.—Lingard, vi. 170.

ancient creed became so intolerable, that numbers were forced to seek an asylum in foreign countries. Among them were various ecclesiastics distinguished for their learning and ability, who established themselves first at Douai, and finally, with the tacit sanction of the King of France, at Rheims.[1] Of these the most eminent was Dr William Allen, a native of Lancashire, who afterwards became deeply implicated in the various plots which, during the next few years, were hatched against Elizabeth. With the aid of a few zealous coadjutors, who like himself had sought a refuge abroad from the storm of Protestant persecution, he founded a seminary, which became a favourite place of resort with the Catholic youth of England, and from which, from time to time, emissaries were despatched in secret to their native country to watch the progress of events, to administer religious consolation to their fellow-sufferers throughout the kingdom, or to concert measures for the overthrow of Protestantism and the deposition of Elizabeth.

The persecution of the Catholics, if not caused, was seriously aggravated, by the presence of Mary Stewart in England, and tended much to widen the breach between her and her sister queen. Mary could not but regard the sufferings of her friends[2] and adherents with sympathy and indignation; and when to these natural sentiments we add the bitter sense of her own unnumbered wrongs, we need not be surprised to find

[1] Camden, 347; Lingard, vi. 163 *et seq.*

[2] On the 27th September 1580, she writes to her ambassador in Paris: "Les prisons sont ja pleins de ces pauvres gens, lesquelles ont esté si miserablement traitez que le plupart de ceux de leur religion, qui sont en liberté, sont déliberé par desespoir d'abandonner le pays," &c.—Labanoff, v. 180.

that she became more and more disposed to listen to the various schemes which from time to time were devised for the overthrow of her oppressors. To this pass had Burghley, with all his boasted skill in statecraft, brought the two queens at last. After twelve years of laborious intrigue and countless dangers, the situation had become more dangerous, and the future more dark, than ever. In Scotland, in spite of all his efforts, the friends of Mary were once more everywhere triumphant. In France, her cousin Henry of Guise, who inherited all the influence and more than the ambition of his father, had seriously revived the project entertained by his family twenty years before, of invading Britain with the aid of Spain. Ireland was in a state of chronic misery and disaffection; and in 1580, a sanguinary rebellion[1] broke out in that unhappy country, the origin of which was clearly traced to the intrigues of English refugees in France and Spain, who were secretly supplied with money and arms by Philip, in retaliation for the many unwarrantable acts of hostility committed against him by Elizabeth.

That the dangers which threatened England at this time were of the most formidable kind, is not to be disputed; but that they were the direct and necessary consequence of the policy of her rulers, is no less plain. The great Catholic Powers had sought no quarrel with Elizabeth. France, after the outbreak of the religious war in 1560, and Spain, after the revolt of the Netherlands, had abundance of occupation in their own dominions without dreaming of foreign conquest. They no more thought of attacking England than they did of assailing Denmark, Switzerland, or the Protestant States

[1] Camden, 153, 156; Leland, 225-242.

of Germany. But with the advent of the Reformation a new kind of policy had sprung up in England, which may be said to have culminated under the auspices of Cecil. When in former times she had taken part in Continental broils, she had never hesitated to declare openly who were her enemies and who were her friends. But she was now professedly at peace with the Kings of France and Spain, while in reality she was straining every nerve to perpetuate the most deadly kind of civil war in their dominions. The petty princes of Italy had long practised this kind of underhand dealing with their neighbours, but it was a policy unworthy of a free and martial people: nor can it, on the whole, be said to have proved successful; for although long pursued with impunity, it roused at last against Elizabeth a spirit of hostility, her escape from the consequences of which may be described as all but miraculous.

It has been said that the hostility at this time manifested against the English queen by the Catholic Powers was in fact a conspiracy against the Reformation.[1] It may be much more truly described as the natural and necessary consequence of the meddling, treacherous, and essentially aggressive policy of Cecil. The public life of this renowned minister consists, indeed, of little more than a series of conspiracies against the Catholic Powers; and if they eventually became the assailants in their turn, neither he nor his mistress could in reason complain that the weapons they had so long employed should be turned at length against themselves.

It may be said, in defence of Cecil's policy, that

[1] Froude, xi. c. 27, 28.

England was no longer in his day the first military Power in Europe, which she unquestionably had been during a great portion of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; and that by fomenting insurrection in France and Flanders, and encouraging wholesale privateering against the commerce of Spain, he availed himself of the only means of offence which he possessed. Had he acted throughout on the defensive, this plea would be a good one; but it is notorious that although singularly deficient in the qualities requisite for successful aggression, he was the aggressor in every instance. It is a serious imputation upon a statesman, that although ever ready to provoke hostility, he was helpless in the hour of danger; yet his manifest inability to deal with the northern rebellion in 1569,[1] and still more the total want of vigour and foresight which he subsequently displayed when England was threatened with the Armada,[2] prove incontestably that Lord Burghley lay open to this grave charge. From the influence which he acquired over Elizabeth, and the prominent part he took in the establishment of the Reformation in England, the virtues of this celebrated person have been much extolled; and it must be admitted that in industry and vigilance no minister ever surpassed him. But in other and rarer qualities he will not bear comparison even with contemporary statesmen. He possessed neither the deep impenetrable craft of Murray, the versatility of Maitland, the commanding intellect of Sussex, nor the vigour and dexterity of Walsingham. From the enormous mass

[1] *Ante*, vol. i. 500.

[2] The proofs of this, which Mr Motley has given in his valuable history of the revolt of the Netherlands, are numerous and conclusive. See chapters 17 and 18.

of papers which Burghley has left behind him, written for the most part with his own hand, we learn that he arrived at his conclusions by slow and painful steps; and from his habit of laboriously balancing the arguments on every question which came before him, we can perceive that the difficulty which he experienced in making up his mind on any given subject sensibly increased with age. There were only two points from which, in his latter days at least, he never swerved—his fixed purpose to maintain the Reformation, and his hostility to Mary Stewart.

At an earlier period of his career he had exhibited a very different spirit; for in choosing his religion, as well as his politics, interest and convenience were his only guides. He owed his first advancement in public life to the Protector Somerset; but on the fall of that ambitious noble, he at once transferred his services to Northumberland, the mortal enemy of his former patron.[1] In religion, Cecil had shown himself to be equally pliant. He had, with characteristic prudence, professed himself a Protestant under Edward VI., and a Papist under his sister Mary.[2] On the accession of Elizabeth, he became a Protestant once more, and to the new creed he steadfastly adhered during the remainder of his days. As during his long tenure of office he did not hesitate to accept a very considerable share of the forfeited property of the Church,[3] we have every reason

[1] See Memoirs of Lord Burghley, by Dr Nares, chap. xiii. 22 *et seq.*

[2] Ibid. In the year 1554 he was sent to Brussels, along with the Lord Paget, to bring Cardinal Pole to England.—Nares, i. chap. xxxix.

[3] Lord Macaulay says that he "was so moderate in his desires that he left only three hundred distinct landed estates" at his death.—Essay on Lord Burghley, from the Edinburgh Review, April 1832.

to believe in the sincerity of his final conversion to the doctrines of the Reformation.

At this time the Lord Treasurer was busily occupied with an affair of great delicacy and importance. After a protracted display of caprice and vanity which threw into the shade all her former exhibitions of a similar kind, Elizabeth had at length, to all appearance, made up her mind to marry the youngest son of Catherine de Medici. Neither in point of age, character, country, or religion, was the Duke of Alençon a suitable husband for the English queen. He was only twenty-four years old, while she was forty-nine: his morals were such as might have been expected in a son of Catherine and a brother of Henry III.: his countrymen were popularly regarded as the natural enemies of England; and although, to win the favour of Elizabeth, he had appeared in arms with the Huguenots, he was universally believed to be a bigoted Papist, like all his race. But Burghley was too wary a politician to run the risk of incurring the hostility and hatred of his mistress by opposing her on a point upon which she seemed to have set her heart. Believing that her wandering affections were fixed at last, he expressed his cordial approval of the match; and when commissioners arrived from France to settle the final terms of the contract, he invited them to an entertainment at his private house,[1] which, from its splendour and costliness, enables us to form some

[1] This banquet took place on *Sunday*, the 30th of April 1581, at Burghley House, in the Strand. See an elaborate account of it in the 'Life and Times of Lord Burghley,' by Dr Nares, iii. 162. Among the articles consumed were 360 pounds of butter and 3300 eggs, and the cost of the entertainment was £649, 1s. 5d., a very large sum in the sixteenth century.

notion of the wealth he had acquired in the service of the Crown. It is worthy of note that the Queen of Scots expressed her strong approval of the Alençon match.[1] It may seem difficult to account for this remarkable fact, for the marriage of Elizabeth must certainly have diminished Mary's chances of the English succession, of which, amid all her anxieties and troubles, she had never lost sight. But her desire for liberty was now stronger than her ambition; and she no doubt concluded, that if her brother-in-law became the consort of the English queen, she could no longer in decency detain her in captivity.

Sussex also approved of the marriage, we may assume on public grounds alone. Philip had recently added Portugal to his vast dominions; and the Alençon match appeared to be the surest means of preventing that coalition between France and Spain which English politicians so justly dreaded. But there were other members of the Council who took a different view of the projected union. The veteran Sadler and Sir Walter Mildmay were decidedly opposed to it. Bromley the Lord Chancellor and Walsingham were of the same opinion; and Sir Philip Sidney, the celebrated nephew of Leicester, even ventured to warn Elizabeth, in a long and eloquent letter,[2] of the dangers of the match. John Stubbs, a Puritan lawyer of Lincoln's Inn, in a pamphlet which he published at this time, addressed the queen in language still more plain. He told her that she was too old to bear children, and

[1] See letter of Castelnau to the King of France, 8th February 1580-81, Teulet, iii. 65, in which he says that Mary had written to him saying that she desired the marriage "plus que sa propre libérte."

[2] It is printed in Cabala, p. 363.

asked how she, a daughter of God, could consent to marry a son of the devil. Elizabeth was furious; but not daring to meddle with the all-accomplished Sidney, she declared she would hang Stubbs, as well as the printer and publisher of his wicked pamphlet. Finding, however, that it was impossible to obtain against them a conviction for treason, they were indicted under a statute which was passed in the reign of Philip and Mary for the punishing of libels against the "husband" of the queen. Some of the legal authorities maintained with reason that this could not be taken to include a suitor or "intended husband" of the sovereign. Manson, one of the judges of the Court of Common Pleas, was of this opinion, and rather than retract it he resigned his post.[1] But Stubbs, the writer of the pamphlet, and Page, the printer, were speedily arraigned before a sufficiently complaisant tribunal; and although Castelnau, the French ambassador, interceded on their behalf, they were both condemned to lose their right hands. The people witnessed this new and barbarous punishment in gloomy silence, and while they admired the manly fortitude of the sufferers,[2] regarded with increasing aversion the projected French alliance.

Camden, who was present at the mutilation of Stubbs and Page, informs us that, in order to allay the discontent of the Puritans and reassure the nation on the subject of religion, Elizabeth was strongly advised

[1] Camden, 239.

[2] "I remember (being present thereat) that when Stubbs, having his right hand cut off, put off his hat with his left, and said with a loud voice, 'God save the Queen.'"—Camden, 239. Page seems to have displayed equal courage.

at this time to enforce to their full extent the penal laws against the Catholics. It is probable that, in consequence of her relations with Alençon, she adopted with reluctance the advice of her ministers; but it must be admitted that at this time they had good grounds for alarm. The overthrow of Morton had revived the hopes of the Catholics, and various consultations had been held at Rheims as to the steps to be taken in consequence of the revolution in Scotland. It was finally determined, in concert with the English refugees in Paris and the Jesuit College at Rome, that a new proposal should be made to Mary. Her son was now fifteen, and although he had been strictly brought up in the Protestant faith, it was hoped that, through the influence of Lennox, who was certainly at this time playing a double game, the prince might be eventually induced to adopt the religion of his fathers. With this object in view, as well as with that of relieving his mother from captivity, it was now proposed that she should be associated with her son in the government of Scotland. Mary had hitherto refused to acknowledge in any shape the sovereignty of her son. She maintained that she, and she alone, was Queen of Scotland; and in the year 1579, her French secretary Nau,[1] who had been permitted to carry some presents from her to her son, was not allowed to see him because she did not acknowledge him as king.[2] But, wearied of her long imprisonment, she now yielded to the advice of her friends, backed as it was by a letter written in his own hand by Henry III.,[3] and gave her consent

[1] Nau, who had been in the service of the Cardinal of Lorraine, became secretary to Mary on the death of Raulet in 1574.—See Labanoff.

[2] Robertson, ii. 388.

[3] Henry's letter is printed by Cheruel, 'Marie Stuart et Catherine de

to the scheme of the association. Robert Parsons, an English Jesuit, in high repute with his superiors in France, was the instrument selected to arrange the details. He arrived at Dover in June 1581, disguised in the uniform of an English volunteer who had been serving in the Low Countries. He well knew that detection would certainly be followed by imprisonment and torture at the least. But he escaped Walsingham's spies, and made his way to London, where he was in comparative security. A correspondence was now opened up with the Scottish court by means of a young Scottish Jesuit named Crichton. This emissary was received with secret cordiality by Aubigny, by the Catholic nobility, and even by James himself, who at this time had a grudge against Elizabeth. His grandmother, the Countess of Lennox, had died, leaving considerable estates in England, and these he claimed as her lineal representative. But Elizabeth's reluctance to part with property of any kind amounted to a passion; and, in spite of the remonstrances of her godson, she seemed resolved to keep the Lennox estates to herself.[1]

The character of James had now begun to develop itself; and although deprived in his infancy of the care of both parents, he already exhibited some of the most

Medici,' p. 91. Catherine also wrote to Mary recommending the project of the association. Her letter is also printed by Cheruel, ibid.

[1] By the law of succession in England, these estates belonged, not to the King of Scots, but to his cousin-german, Arabella Stewart, who was a daughter of his uncle, Lord Charles Lennox (a younger brother of Darnley), and Elizabeth Cavendish, a daughter of the Countess of Shrewsbury by her first husband, Sir William Cavendish. Both the parents of Arabella Stewart died when she was an infant. But she was born in England; and therefore, according to the rules of English law, was the true heir of her grandmother, to the exclusion of the King of Scots, who was an alien, and was as such incapable of inheriting real estate.

striking qualities of both. He seemed to possess much of his mother's intelligence, still more of his father's duplicity and dissimulation, and a certain native shrewdness peculiar to himself, the result apparently of early training, and of the singular circumstances in which from his earliest years he had been placed. In the present instance his sincerity may well be doubted: but the Crown revenues of Scotland had, under the four successive regencies, and more especially under that of Morton, dwindled down to a very insignificant amount; the young king was much in want of money; Elizabeth was not only unwilling to assist him, but seemed determined to rob him of his grandmother's inheritance; and the prospect of a seasonable supply from the Pope and the King of Spain induced him to listen to the proposals of the Jesuit emissary. Without formally committing himself to any definite arrangement, James, acting no doubt by the advice of Lennox, agreed to receive at his court a Catholic priest, ostensibly for the purpose of teaching him Italian; and he further engaged to the utmost of his power to protect his mother's adherents from persecution.[1]

Mary had meanwhile communicated the plan of the association both to Elizabeth[2] and to Lord Burghley; and she proposed that they should send an envoy to Scotland, in company with one to be named by her, to settle the conditions. But as the English queen and her ministers had been consulting very shortly before as to the expediency of putting her to death, we need not be surprised that Mary's letters received no

[1] Lingard, vi. 175.

[2] Labanoff, v., Letters of 10th October, 266, 271.

satisfactory reply. It was determined, however, to send down Robert Beale, the brother-in-law of Walsingham and clerk of the Council, to Sheffield Castle, not with the purpose of coming to any arrangement with Mary, but, if possible, to discover the nature of her engagements with Scotland and Spain. One good result, however, followed from Beale's visit. Although as a Puritan he regarded Mary as a public enemy, he was satisfied that her health was in a very precarious state. She was, in fact, at this time unable to walk; and in consequence of his advice, a coach, which the French ambassador had provided for her, was as a special favour allowed to be sent to Sheffield Castle for her use.[1]

Beale left Sheffield towards the end of November, and through the winter Mary looked anxiously for some definite answer to her very reasonable proposals. But none came, and in the interval she was apprised by Lennox of the projected plan of invasion by the Duke of Guise.[2] Notwithstanding the disappointment and delay, she still clung to the hope that Elizabeth would agree to the plan of the association; and in the beginning of April

[1] Mr Froude, xi. 472, insinuates that on Beale's arrival at Sheffield Mary pretended to be sick. He says, speaking of Beale, "He found her in bed, with the room darkened. She said she was ill and unable to bear the light, but he ascertained afterwards that the candles had been extinguished immediately before he was admitted. She revived rapidly when she heard the character of his message," &c. Mr Froude obviously means his readers to infer that Mary was pretending to be ill when she was really well. But he omits to state, not only that Beale minutely described the alarming condition of the queen, but that in consequence of what he saw and heard he recommended a coach to be sent for her use. In fact, for many weeks after Beale left Sheffield Castle, Mary was confined to her apartments. On the 6th of January 1582, Shrewsbury wrote to Walsingham "that she had not been out yet, as she was still very weak, but free from pain."—Record Office; and Chalmers, ii. 96.

[2] His letter is printed in Mignet, Appendix L, 334, edition 1851.

1582, Beale paid a second visit to Sheffield Castle, ostensibly with the view of arranging the details. That Mary, in spite of all she had endured, was sincerely desirous of coming to terms with her rival at this time was certainly the opinion of Beale himself. Nor are her motives difficult of explanation. She knew well that any scheme of foreign invasion must prove hazardous in the extreme; that in the event of failure her life would certainly be sacrificed, and, what she dreaded still more, the chances of her son's succession to the English crown destroyed. We can well understand, therefore, that on mature consideration she should assure Beale "that she desired, above all things, her majesty's favour and friendship, which, *if she might be assured of*, then would she prefer the same above all others, and make thereof an open demonstration against all that might seek to disturb the quietness of her majesty's estate and benefit of the realm."[1] She further added "that her meaning was to persuade her son to embrace her majesty's favour and amity above all others, for that would in her opinion be most for his benefit, and so was desirous to leave him in good terms of amity with her majesty (being herself diseased and not like to continue long)." She trusted, in conclusion, that her son would in his marriage be guided by the advice and direction of the Queen of England.[2]

But it is plain that Elizabeth had no other motive in sending Beale a second time to Sheffield Castle except to play once more her old game of deception and delay. Although she professed to regard with favour the plan of the association, she was, for vari-

[1] Lodge, ii. 212. [2] Ibid.

ous reasons, decidedly opposed to it. Instead of promoting concord between the mother and her son, she was persuaded that her interest would be best served by sowing dissension between them; and in this design she eventually succeeded beyond her expectations.

Mary has been accused[1] of double dealing at this time, because, while she was expressing her earnest wish to come to terms with Elizabeth, she was secretly corresponding with Aubigny and the Court of Spain, as if her thirteen years' experience of prison life in England ought to have inspired her with perfect confidence in the honour and fair dealing of her keepers, and induced her to reject absolutely all offers of foreign aid.[2] That she would have much preferred a peaceful solution of all differences between her and Elizabeth to the desperate expedient of an invasion is abundantly clear. But her advances were met, as heretofore, with trickery and falsehood. The long delay between the visits of Beale was in itself suspicious; and when he appeared at last, it was not as a negotiator, but as a spy. He was without definite powers of any kind; and while she was required, as at Chatsworth, to bind herself to everything, her rival bound herself to nothing.[3] Mary had been often imposed upon by her enemies, but to have at this time absolutely rejected all offers of foreign aid in blind reliance on the friendship of

[1] Froude, xi. c. 30.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Mary reminded Beale of this in a letter which she wrote to him on the 16th of April 1582. She complains that up to that time she had received "rien eu par escript de la Royne, ma dicte bonne sœur, ou de son conseil, et demeurant s'il fault dire, soubz la puissance de ceux avec qui je traite, restans libres de performer ce que bon leur semblera et m'obligeans de servir à leur advantage."—Labanoff, v. 292.

Elizabeth, was a piece of folly of which she was incapable.

The conspirators at Rheims who had planned the scheme of the association between Mary and her son, had, in addition, cordially approved of the daring project of the Duke of Guise. Henry III., enervated by debauchery, and entirely the tool of his mother, had lost the confidence of both the contending factions, and Guise was universally regarded as the leader of the Catholics of France, as Henry of Navarre, the next heir of the crown after the house of Valois, was the acknowledged chief of the Huguenots. It was proposed that Guise should land with a sufficient force, either in Scotland or in the north of England—where the Catholic element was strongest, and where the people had not yet forgotten the butchery of 1569—and with the aid of a Scottish army to liberate the Scottish queen, and to place her, along with her son, on the throne of Elizabeth.

Mary had been apprised of this dangerous project as well by Aubigny, who had now been created Duke of Lennox,[1] as by the Spanish ambassador in London, Don Bernardino de Mendoza. After the expulsion of D'Espès in 1571, six years elapsed before another representative of the King of Spain appeared in England. But nothing is more remarkable in the history of this age than the anxiety of Philip, notwithstanding all the provocations he had received, to remain at peace with Elizabeth. Not only were English volun-

[1] He was at the same time appointed commendator or lay abbot of Aberbrothwick, a sinecure, according to Castelnau, worth upwards of 10,000 crowns a-year.—Teulet, iii. 75; letter to the King of France of 27th May 1580.

teers continually flocking in hundreds across the Channel to join the insurgents in the Netherlands, but, shortly before Mendoza's arrival in London, Francis Drake had sailed for the Pacific, on that memorable expedition which filled the queen's coffers, as well as his own, with the plunder of Spanish subjects. But beyond a formal protest, Philip took no means to avenge the innumerable depredations committed throughout his American dominions by Drake and his brother buccaneers.

Mendoza, who was by profession a soldier, proud of his high birth and jealous of the honour of his country, would have taken another course. But he was bound by his instruction to conciliate and temporise, and although often provoked by the caprices of Elizabeth, of whom he appears to have entertained but a mean opinion,[1] he awaited patiently that turn in the tide of events which he believed must eventually lead his sovereign to victory and vengeance.

When Don John of Austria had proposed to invade England for the purpose of liberating Mary Stewart, she had, as we have seen, regarded the scheme with coldness, if not with absolute disapproval. But four years had since elapsed, and the prospect of release from her captivity seemed still as distant as ever.[2] The continued confinement to which she had been

[1] See his letter to Philip in Froude, xi. 392.

[2] Writing to her ambassador in Paris, after Beale's second visit, Mary expresses the most profound distrust of Elizabeth and her ministers. She says: "Ayant eu tant des preuves d'experience de leur malignité contre moy que je ne peux aulcunement m'asseurer d'eux, ny appréhendre qu'ils me puissent ou veuillent bien faire jamais, ores que je le veisse quasi devant mes yeux."—Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 7th April 1582; Labanoff, v. 284.

subjected had ruined her once fine constitution; at the age of thirty-eight her limbs were crippled by periodical attacks of rheumatism, and her hair had turned to grey.[1] With failing health, and no prospect of release except in death, we need not be surprised that she did not reject the chivalrous offer of her cousin the Duke of Guise, and that, provided she was satisfied upon two points, she was prepared to sanction it. Of these the first was, that it should be approved of by the Pope and the King of Spain; and the second, that the state of parties in Scotland[2] was sufficiently encouraging to warrant the attempt being made. Lennox had assured her that two-thirds of her subjects were prepared to espouse her cause,[3] but she desired more precise information upon this essential point before giving her final sanction to so hazardous an enterprise.

The contrast between the explicit language which she addressed to Beale and her qualified approval of the design of Guise, seems to indicate with sufficient clearness the true state of Mary's mind at this time. It was only when she believed that her negotiations with Elizabeth had failed that she was prepared,

[1] So she informed Beale, adding that she had no thought now of marrying again. Unlike her sister queen, Mary was singularly devoid of vanity. I recollect no other instance of her referring to her personal appearance.—See Beale's letter in Harl. MSS., 291.

[2] "Il ni a que deux points, c'est à savoir s'il plait au Pope et au roy Catholique. L'autre point que in Scotia, toutes coses y soyent soigneusment preparé," &c.—Mary Stewart to Don Bernardino de Mendoza, 6th April 1582; printed by Mignet, Appendix L, from Simancas. This letter was written a few days after Beale's second visit to Sheffield—that is, after she had ascertained that, notwithstanding the unwarrantable delay that had taken place, he was still without authority to come to any terms, or even to make her any offer.

[3] See his letter, Mignet; Appendix L, 340.

under certain circumstances and conditions, to sanction the hazardous expedient of an invasion.

Meanwhile the Catholics in England were subjected to the most cruel persecutions. Strenuous efforts were made to discover Parsons, the object of whose mission was strongly suspected; but he was fortunate enough to elude pursuit, and finally made his escape from England. A very different fate awaited his friend and fellow-student Edmund Campian. That celebrated person was arrested at the house of a gentlewoman in Berkshire, whose husband had been sent to prison on account of his religion. Campian had landed in England shortly after Parsons, but there is no proof that he was employed on a political mission, or that he had taken any part in the intrigues of his companion.[1] No society that ever existed knew so well how to employ, to the best advantage, the talents and acquirements of its different members, as that of the Jesuits; and when Parsons was busily conspiring against Elizabeth, Campian was wholly absorbed in the duties of his sacred calling. Endowed with great powers of eloquence and enthusiastically devoted to his work, he spent his days and nights in administering spiritual consolation to his persecuted countrymen, and cheering them with the hopes, even in this life, of a brighter future. While a youth at Oxford he had acquired high distinction, and he was now in the full maturity of his powers,

[1] Camden, who had known both Parsons and Campian as fellow-students at Oxford, thus describes them: "This Parsons was a Somersetshire man, vehement, fierce of nature, and of rude behaviour; Campian was of London, a sweet-natured and most courteous man; both of them by education Oxford men, whom I myself knew, being their equal in the university in those days."—P. 217.

the apostle whom the Pope had specially chosen to bring back England from the path of heresy and revolution to the bosom of the Church. In the absence of Parsons no more desirable victim could be found. Along with six other seminary priests Campian was accordingly sent to the Tower, where all were repeatedly and most savagely tortured, but to no purpose. If any of them had been acquainted with the secret object of the mission of Parsons, it is not probable that they would have remained silent under the terrible inflictions which they endured.

Although there was literally no evidence against them, it was determined that they should all be indicted for high treason under the statute of Edward III.: on that charge they were accordingly arraigned on the 12th November 1581.[1] Campian's right arm had been dislocated on the rack, and when he appeared in court he was unable, without assistance, to raise his hand. All pleaded Not Guilty, and the only positive evidence against Campian was given by a witness named Elliot, a creature of the Earl of Leicester. This man swore that he heard Campian preach a sermon in Berkshire in which he lamented the prevalence of heresy in England, and expressed a confident hope that it would be speedily overthrown. It was contended by the counsel for the Crown that allusion was here clearly made to a political revolution which was to be accomplished by means of foreign arms. "Oh Judas, Judas!" exclaimed Campian, with

[1] Eight other persons were indicted along with Campian—namely, Sherwin, Briant, Bosgrave, Cotham, Johnson, Bristow, Kirbie, and Orton. The name of Briant has been erroneously omitted in the list of the accused given in the State Trials.—See Howell, i. 1050.

justifiable indignation, "no other day was in my mind, I protest, than that wherein it should please God to make a restoration of faith and religion."[1] He further declared that he well knew his religion was his only crime, for he and his companions had been offered their lives and their liberty if they would consent to hear a Protestant sermon. But his ability and eloquence were exerted in vain. He, as well as all his companions, were found guilty and condemned to die as traitors.

It is highly probable that Elizabeth consented with reluctance to the death of these unfortunate men. So great was Campian's reputation that, while he was a prisoner in the Tower, periodically undergoing the torture of the rack, and living upon mouldy bread and filthy water, she expressed a strong desire to see him. He was brought accordingly to Leicester's house and introduced to the queen, whom he readily acknowledged as his lawful sovereign. But on the question of the Papal supremacy he declined to give any definite opinion, as it was a point upon which the most learned men held conflicting views. This reply proved fatal; and in company with Sherwin and Briant, the latter a youth of four-and-twenty, he was consigned to Tyburn on the 1st of December. While they were on the scaffold, Sir Francis Knollys was commissioned to offer them their lives if they would consent to hear a Protestant sermon.[2] This important fact confirms to the letter the assertion of Campian, that their religion was their only crime. It seemed further to afford a practical refutation of the oft-repeated calumny that the oath of a Catholic was

[1] State Trials, i. 1065.

[2] See Froude, xi. 357.

not binding on his conscience. Such was the faith reposed in the honour of these poor sufferers for conscience' sake, that a bare promise of outward conformity to the new religion would have saved their lives. Without a moment's hesitation they all refused to give it, and were one by one consigned to the hangman's hands. To the intervention of the queen we must attribute the fact that they were not cut down till they were dead. That horrible portion of the sentence pronounced upon them, which condemned a convicted traitor to be disembowelled alive, was in this instance omitted. Of the remaining prisoners convicted along with Campian, three saved their lives by a promise of conformity, the rest were executed.[1]

In Scotland the two favourites, Lennox and Arran, still held undisputed sway. But a coalition, composed of certain of the nobility and the whole of the Presbyterian clergy, was being rapidly formed against them. Lennox had grievously offended the zealots of the Kirk by his avowed preference for Episcopacy; and John Durie, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, had assailed the favourites from his pulpit with a virulence worthy of Knox. He further imitated the great Reformer in the insolent familiarity with which he treated the young king. James was always passionately fond of hunting, and the Duke of Guise about this time had sent him a present of some horses. No sooner did Durie hear of this than he hastened to Kinneil,[2] where the king was at the time residing, and

[1] Lingard, c. v.

[2] Kinneil, in West Lothian, had been a seat of the Hamiltons, but was now the residence of Arran, the king's favourite.

demanding an audience, rebuked him for receiving gifts from his cousin, whom he denounced as a murderer of the saints and an emissary of the devil. Overawed by the vehemence of the man, James meekly replied that he had no intention of changing his religion, and that he would marry no woman "who did not fear God and love the Evangel."[1]

Emboldened by his success, Durie returned to Edinburgh, and indulged in such unmeasured abuse of Lennox and the mother of the king, that he was summoned before the Council and ordered to quit the city. The General Assembly, which met shortly afterwards, under the presidency of Andrew Melvill, a preacher of still greater repute, protested strenuously against the banishment of Durie, but without effect.[2] Lennox and Arran were still omnipotent at court, and as they defied the thunders of the clergy, it was necessary, to effect their overthrow, to resort to other means.

A bond was accordingly drawn up similar to those which had been prepared previous to the murders of Riccio and Darnley. That Lennox should share the fate of those successive victims of feudal violence was clearly the intention of the conspirators. That they also meditated the death of Arran is highly probable, although it does not appear that he was suspected of being in any way mixed up with the designs of the Duke of Guise. But circumstances favoured the escape of both the favourites, and their enemies were enabled to accomplish their purpose without bloodshed.

Lord Ruthven had been created Earl of Gowrie in

[1] Tytler, viii. 98.

[2] Ibid., 100, 101.

1581, and in August of the following year the young king paid him a visit at his castle near Perth, with the purpose of enjoying his favourite amusement of hunting. The plans of the conspirators were not yet matured; but Sir Robert Bowes, who was privy to the plot, furnished them with information which induced them to adopt the sudden resolution of making a prisoner of the king, an incident for which they had many precedents in Scottish history. The English ambassador informed Gowrie and his friends that Lennox had discovered their intrigues, and that as soon as he could muster a sufficient force for the purpose, he intended to treat them as he had treated their old confederate Morton.[1] It so happened that neither of the favourites had accompanied James to Ruthven Castle; and three of the conspirators—Gowrie, Lindsay, and Glammis—were all-powerful in the neighbourhood of Perth. To assemble a thousand of their retainers, to surround the castle and disarm the king's guards, was the work of a few hours; and Gowrie and his friends affected to treat the young king with so much deference that he could not believe he was a prisoner. But in the morning he learned the bitter truth. Hearing him order his horse, Glammis informed him that for the present it was deemed safer that his majesty should

[1] This is a very improbable story; for if Lennox had discovered the designs of the conspirators, why should he have trusted the king in their hands? That it was a device of Walsingham to spur them on is much more probable. Writing to him on the 26th August, Bowes says: "*According to your late direction*, and to the contents of my last letters to you, I have given notice by means of my good friends, to the Earls of Mar and Gowrie, the Lord Lindsay, Boyd, and others, to beware of the practice intended against them," &c.—Bowes' Correspondence, 178.

remain at Ruthven Castle. James declared that he would go where he pleased, and was about to leave the apartment when Glammis rudely placed his leg across the doorway so as to bar the passage. The young king was moved to tears by this indignity, and some of the lords remonstrated with Glammis: "Better that bairns should greet than bearded men," was the baron's stern reply.[1]

On hearing of the captivity of the king, Arran rode at full speed to Ruthven Castle, desiring his brother, Sir William Stewart, to follow with as large a force as he could hastily collect. But on his arrival at the gate he was immediately made a prisoner;[2] and his brother, who set out shortly after him with a party of horse, was attacked and defeated before they reached Perth by the Earl of Mar and the Laird of Lochleven, who were on the watch to prevent any interference with the plans of the conspirators. Lennox was at his castle of Dalkeith[3] when he heard the unexpected news, and had he possessed the vigour and promptitude of Arran he might speedily have turned the tables on his enemies. The position of affairs bore a remarkable resemblance to that when the king's mother was sent a prisoner to Lochleven. The leaders, Ruthven and Lindsay, had taken part in both plots, and in neither did the conspirators against the Crown represent the majority of the Scottish nobles. Lennox could still count upon his side the Earls of Huntly, Sutherland, Orkney,[4]

[1] Tytler, viii. 110; and Spottiswoode, ii. 290. [2] Tytler, ii. 109.

[3] Dalkeith had been the property of Morton as Kinneil had been that of the Hamiltons.

[4] Lord Robert Stewart, one of the illegitimate sons of James V., recently created Earl of Orkney.

Crawford, and Bothwell,[1] together with Lords Herries, Seton, Hume, Sir James Balfour, and all the chief families of the Border. But Lennox was wholly unequal to the emergency. Although an adept in intrigue, he shrank from the prospect of a struggle with Gowrie and his friends, backed as he knew they were by the whole influence of the Kirk, as well as by that of Elizabeth. Instead of rallying his numerous followers around him, he seemed incapable of forming a resolution, and was unprepared alike to fight or fly. The clergy did not fail to take advantage of his hesitation, and John Durie not only continued to assail him with impunity, but returned to Edinburgh in a kind of triumph. Two thousand citizens received him bareheaded at the gates, and accompanied him to the High Church, singing, as they marched by his side, the 124th Psalm. Lennox witnessed the procession in dismay from a window in the town, and shortly afterwards retired in haste to his castle of Dumbarton. Thence he repaired to France,[2] where he soon afterwards died. James was deeply affected by the loss of his earliest favourite, and he evinced the sincerity of his attachment by the warm interest he subsequently took in the fortunes of his descendants.

In this year died one of the worst of Mary's enemies, the prince of literary prostitutes, Buchanan. His perfect mastery of the Latin tongue acquired

[1] A nephew by the mother's side of the famous earl, who died without descendants.

[2] In May 1583. In the autumn of the same year, his eldest son, the young Duke of Lennox, who was only thirteen years old, arrived in Scotland, and was treated by James with the utmost kindness.—Tytler, viii. 161, note.

him a European reputation, but his works are in general more remarkable for mere elegance of style than for their intrinsic merit. First the sycophant and then the slanderer of his sovereign, his pen was ever at the service of the highest bidder. But his powers were better adapted for flattery than invective. Nothing can be more finished than some of his laudatory verses upon Mary; nothing can be more ridiculous than the gross exaggerations of the 'Detection.' It is said by Camden[1] that he expressed remorse, in his latter days, at having written that foul libel; but this it is difficult to believe, for the man who feels remorse must have a conscience. It is possible, however, that upon mature reflection he may have been heartily ashamed of its unredeemed absurdity. Buchanan had been soured by poverty in his youth; and prosperity, when it came at last, seems only to have hardened his cynical and sullen nature. His reputation in his own day was immensely overrated. As a work of authority, his history is all but worthless. The early books are purely fabulous; and the latter portion of the work, which has been industriously copied by the Protestant writers of the Continent, consists of little more than a series of libels against the sovereign who first raised him from obscurity. Obscene thoughts dressed up in a dead language are often apt to please, which in their nakedness would only inspire disgust; and to this circumstance we may perhaps ascribe whatever popularity Buchanan's satires may have at any time acquired. By far the most important of his works were his political discourses;[2] for they propounded doctrines which,

[1] Annals, anno 1582.

[2] De jure regni apud Scotos.

although not new on the Continent, were new in Britain,[1] and which exercised, eventually, considerable influence on the opinions of the age. Although he could not venture openly to advocate the abolition of monarchy, it is easy to perceive in these discourses that Buchanan was at bottom a bigoted republican; for, like many other men who, before and since his time, have sought to revolutionise the world, he seems to have become, in his latter days, a fanatic in his politics and a freethinker in his religion.[2]

Mary's hopes of liberty were once more destroyed by the success of Gowrie's plot; but she was less moved by her own misfortune than by that which had befallen her son. In his captivity she seemed to read a painful repetition of her own history. He was now in the absolute power of the same ruthless faction which had deposed, imprisoned, and sought to murder her. Morton, indeed, was gone; but was more reliance to be placed on the humanity and loyalty of Ruthven and Lindsay, his old accomplices in crime? She was at the time unable from illness to leave her chamber, but, overwhelmed with anxiety and grief, she addressed a long letter to Elizabeth, in which she recounted with singular eloquence and power the history of all she had endured in England. In this remarkable narrative she reminded her rival, for the first time, of an incident both interesting in itself and characteristic of the manners of the age. She bade Elizabeth remember that she had sent her a diamond ring, in token of her friendship and affection, when she was

[1] See remarks of Hallam on the subject—'Literature of the Middle Ages.'

[2] "A Stoick philosopher," according to Melvill; Memoirs, 125.

a prisoner at Lochleven, with an assurance that if she could effect her escape, the English queen would meet her on the Border with a force sufficient to protect her against her rebellious subjects. She added that it was in consequence of this and other oft-repeated promises of aid that she was induced to take refuge in England,[1] where she had ever since been not only treated as a prisoner, but continually assailed by calumny, and even denied the exercise of her religion. She further declared that the falsehood of the slanderous charges brought against her by her rebels at Westminster had been thoroughly exposed; and if, on the conclusion of that inquiry, the chief nobility of England chose to recommend a marriage between her and the Duke of Norfolk, that was a proposal for which they alone were responsible. She further reminded Elizabeth of the anarchy and bloodshed inflicted upon Scotland solely through her in-

[1] Elizabeth did not venture to deny that she had sent the ring in the manner described by Mary. In her instructions to Beale, when again about to visit Sheffield Castle, the complaints of Mary were set out *seriatim*, with a reply to each, to be delivered to the Scottish queen. The following is the complaint and answer respecting the diamond ring :—

4. "A diamant received by her as a token from her majesty, with a promise that her majesty would assist her against her rebels, &c.; upon which assurance she adventured after her defeat to cast herself into the arms of her majesty's protection."

4. "That friendly promise was made before her husband's death, when she caryed herself well; *promises and the bond of friendship are subject to civil interpretation*, and grounded upon virtue; by her miscarriage of herself afterwards this ground fayled, and therefore her majesty was consequently no more tyed to such a promise."—Record Office; Mary Queen of Scots, xii. 49.

The axiom laid down by Elizabeth, that "promises are subject to civil interpretation," is highly characteristic.

trigues. On two several occasions the English queen had induced her, under the fairest pretexts, to persuade her partisans to lay down their arms when they had a sure prospect of victory, and in both instances they were miserably betrayed. For herself she only desired for the future liberty, repose, and the exercise of her religion; yet all were denied to her. "The vilest malefactors in your jails," she continued, "your own born subjects, are heard in their defence. They are neither kept in ignorance of the crimes alleged against them, nor of their accusers. Why should I receive a different treatment, who am a sovereign princess, your nearest kinswoman, and the heiress of your crown? It is this last quality which provokes the malice of my enemies, and has been the chief source of dissension between us. But, alas! they have little cause now to harass me on this behalf; for on my honour I declare to you that I aspire to-day to no other kingdom than that of heaven, to which I look as the blessed termination of all my miseries."[1]

With respect to the late conspiracy in Scotland, she believed that it was directed against her son's life; and so long as he was in the hands of the men who now held him in captivity, she would not regard any writing issued in his name as genuine, nor any act done in his name as lawful.

It must be admitted that in this celebrated letter Mary displayed more eloquence than prudence. She could hardly hope to conciliate her rival by reminding her, in the most pointed terms, of her duplicity and falsehood. But Mary was on many occasions too apt to give expression to her feelings, and anxiety for the

[1] Mary to Elizabeth, 8th November 1582; Labanoff, v. 319.

safety of her son overpowered for the time every other consideration. In order to give as much publicity as possible to her complaints, she sent the letter open to the French ambassador, and by him it was delivered to Elizabeth. What were her feelings on receiving it we do not know, but many months elapsed before she attempted a reply; and when she did, it was in the shape not of a letter, but of instructions to Beale, who, in April 1583, was sent for the third time to Sheffield Castle, to renew the negotiations which had been suspended in consequence of the revolution in Scotland.

Mary was still willing to proceed with the plan of the association recommended to her by the King of France. She was even prepared to make concessions more important than those originally suggested, for she now informed Beale that, provided she obtained her liberty, she was ready to renounce all share in the government of Scotland, to confirm the treaty of Edinburgh, and even to continue to reside in England if Elizabeth so desired. Mary repeated these offers to Sir Walter Mildmay, who joined Beale at Sheffield Castle on the 24th of May, and through them they were communicated to Elizabeth. She lost no time in acquainting Mary that she entirely approved of her proposals.[1] But this information was accompanied by a piece of intelligence which was well calculated to excite the suspicions of the captive queen. She was informed that before proceeding further with the treaty Elizabeth had determined to send an envoy to Scotland, for what purpose was not explained. As James

[1] "Let her understand that we do very well allow of her answers made to you."—Elizabeth to Shrewsbury and Mildmay, 10th June 1583; Record Office.

was at this time a prisoner in the hands of the English faction, Mary could not fail to conclude that some fresh piece of deception was intended. She accordingly informed Shrewsbury that she was much grieved at the resolution of her sister queen; she had from the first proposed and intended that she, as well as Elizabeth, should send an envoy to Scotland to arrange all matters of detail, but that "if the Queen of England now sent alone thither, she could not but hold the treaty as broken."[1]

At the same time Mildmay, who does not appear to have been acquainted with the secret views of the Council, wrote to Walsingham expressing his surprise that the offers of Mary were not at once accepted.[2]

But in consequence of the firm attitude of Mary a change of plans became inevitable, and Elizabeth hastened to inform her that for the present she should not send any one to Scotland.[3] This change of tactics is easily explained. Although we have every reason to believe that a majority of the Council, with Burghley at their head, were decidedly opposed to the liberation of the Scottish queen, they had no desire to bring the negotiations to a close. So long as they could amuse her with fallacious hopes, they were enabled to reply to any representations made by foreign powers, that a treaty was in progress which was intended to restore

[1] Record Office; Shrewsbury and Mildmay to Walsingham, of 15th and 17th June.

[2] Mildmay to Walsingham, 17th June; Record Office. Mildmay expresses surprise that matters being in so critical a state in Scotland, "and this woman offering so much to her majesty, there is no more regard had to it."

[3] Walsingham to Shrewsbury, 18th June; ibid.

her to liberty. It did not, therefore, suit the purpose of Burghley and his friends to allow the negotiations to drop, although, from a paper preserved in the Record Office, we may conclude that it was not their intention to allow their mistress to come to terms with the Queen of Scots if they could prevent it.

This paper,[1] although not in Burghley's handwriting, bears strong internal evidence of having been composed, or at least inspired, by him. It enumerates, according to his usual practice, first the "commodities," and then the "discommodities," to be anticipated from the proposed treaty. Among the latter we find the following: "That her majesty, having detained the Scottish queen so many years, shall, by her enlargement, notify unto the world that she had no just ground to keep her so long." It was further stated that "the ratification of the treaty of Edinburgh will show to the world that her majesty doth doubt her own title without a release from the Queen of Scots, and that her majesty doth enter into this new treaty by fear of peril and of quarrels that may be made by way of Scotland."

But the last and most material object is stated thus: "To treat with the Queen of Scots were prejudicial to the young king, and if *her majesty may treat and conclude with him that were best and most sure;* and so the treaty with that queen not necessary, *and she may remain as she doth.*" [2]

The conclusion, therefore, at which the Council arrived, was that a separate treaty should be made with

[1] It bears date the 2d of October 1583, several months after the visit of Beale and Mildmay to Sheffield.

[2] Record Office, *ubi supra.*

the young King of Scots, and that his mother should be detained in hopeless captivity. We shall find, in the sequel that this advice was followed to the letter.

It is abundantly clear from the correspondence of Beale, Mildmay, and Shrewsbury, that Mary was at this time sincerely desirous of coming to terms with Elizabeth; and it is no less clear that Elizabeth's ministers, or at least a majority of them, were opposed to the release of a princess whom they knew they had grievously wronged, and whose possible accession to the English crown they could not but regard with just alarm.

For some years the Court of France had paid little regard to the affairs of Scotland; but in consequence of the captivity of the young king, two envoys were despatched to Edinburgh to watch the progress of events, and, if possible, to restore the old alliance between the two countries.[1] M. Fénelon, whose knowledge of British politics probably surpassed that of any of his countrymen, and who, during his long residence in England, had won the respect of all parties, was chosen to represent the king, and he was joined in Scotland by M. Maineville, who was an adherent of the house of Guise. The arrival of these diplomatists in Scotland alarmed Elizabeth, and she immediately despatched one of her secretaries, William Davison,[2] who afterwards acted a prominent part in the history of the times, to assist Bowes in watching and counteracting them. It was the object of the French Court to recover, if possible, the influence it had exercised in Scotland since the days of Charlemagne.[3] But the effort was made too late; in other words, the change

[1] Tytler, viii. 125. [2] Ibid. [3] Cheruel, p. 2.

of circumstances, and, above all, the spread of the new religion, rendered the attempt impracticable. The struggle of the factions, however, was renewed; and as Henry was more liberal with his money than Elizabeth, who still persisted in keeping to herself the Lennox estates, the French were still hopeful of ultimate success.

While the two parties were struggling for ascendancy, a deputation from Scotland arrived in London. It consisted of a certain Colonel Stewart,[1] who had become a great favourite with the king, John Colville, a brother of the Laird of Cleish, and David Lindsay, the minister of Leith. Stewart and his colleagues were quite prepared, in the diplomatic language of the day, "to run the English course," provided Elizabeth would give up the Lennox succession, or grant an equivalent in money to their master; and Walsingham earnestly advised her to satisfy the reasonable demands of the Scots.[2] He was well aware of the dangers which threatened his mistress from the side of France, and of the importance at this time of defeating French diplomacy in Scotland. But Elizabeth was blind to everything except to the Lennox estates, which she would upon no account give up, and for which she offered no equivalent. In order perhaps to counteract the effect of Elizabeth's short-sighted parsimony, Leicester entertained Stewart and his colleagues in the most sumptuous manner.[3] But they came in

[1] Castelnau describes him as a poor adventurer, the natural son of some nobleman.—Castlenau to Catherine de Medici, 24th May 1583; Cheruel, 249. Calderwood says that Stewart was first a "cloutter of old shoes:" that he afterwards went to the Low Countries as a common soldier.—Vol. iv. 448.

[2] Walsingham to Bowes, 29th May; Record Office.

[3] Castelnau; Lettres diplomatique in Cheruel.

quest of something more substantial, and they returned to Scotland offended to the last degree with the result of their mission.

The consequences of Elizabeth's obstinacy soon became apparent. James had for a period of ten months been in the hands of the conspirators of Ruthven; but, by the contrivance of Colonel Stewart, he made his escape on the 27th of June, and hastening from Falkland to St Andrews, was there joined by the Earls of Huntly, Argyll, Marischal, Crawford, Montrose, March, and Rothes. Gowrie, who had induced the king to grant him a pardon for his treason, also repaired to St Andrews. His confederates, Angus, Mar, and Glammis, retired in haste to their estates.

Mr Froude states that in consequence of this fresh revolution, Elizabeth was thrown into a state of the utmost alarm, and that, "perplexed and penitent too late, she fled from counsel to counsel, cursing the changeableness of the Scots, as if she had given them cause for constancy. *Secretary Beale went again to Sheffield, carrying proposals, ignominious now, because extorted by fear, to go on with the treaty. Elizabeth might have spared herself the humiliation. In the exulting confidence of expected triumph, the Queen of Scots refused now to be bound by her past promises.*"[1]

The passage we have marked in italics contains not one, but a series of extraordinary mistakes, as may be readily seen from the authority cited in its support. That authority is a letter of Castelnau addressed to the King of France, dated the 31st July, to which is appended a summary of the negotiations that had taken place between Mary on the one part, and Beale

[1] Vol. xi. 589.

and Mildmay on the other, in the previous month of June; and to which reference has been already made. Mr Froude has obviously been misled by the date of Castelnau's letter. But if he had examined the paper subjoined to it, he would have found that the discussions on the treaty commenced on *the 1st of June*,[1] —that is, a few days after the arrival of Mildmay at Sheffield Castle; and we know that they terminated by the middle of that month, when James was still a prisoner in the hands of the Ruthven conspirators. That on hearing of his escape Elizabeth in her alarm once more sent Beale to Sheffield, and that Mary "in the exulting confidence of expected triumph refused to be bound by her promises," are all pure fictions. Beale had left Sheffield Castle before the king's escape; nor did he return thither until negotiations were renewed in the following year.[2]

[1] "Les dicts députez arrivèrent icy le premier de juing," &c.—Teulet, iii. 231. This paper was probably drawn up and sent by M. Nau, Mary's French secretary, to Castelnau. The concluding portion of it shows clearly that it referred only to the negotiations in the month of June; for it describes the proposal of Elizabeth to send an envoy to Scotland, the objections of Mary to that proposal, and its consequent withdrawal by Elizabeth.—Teulet, iii. 237.

[2] We have distinct proof that Mary did not withdraw the offers she had made to Beale and Mildmay. In a letter which she wrote to the French ambassador after she had heard of her son's escape, she says she had heard nothing of the treaty since the departure of Beale; and she requests Castlenau to find out, if possible, the real intentions of Elizabeth regarding it, and also her opinion on the late events in Scotland. She further suggests to Castelnau that he might give Elizabeth a hint, *as if from himself*, that if she did not come to a speedy decision on the matter, she (Mary) might consider herself no longer bound by her proposals. "Poursuivez, je vous prie, *mais comme de vous memes*, et non sur aucune nouvelle instance que j'en face, de scavoir particulièrement la finale résolution de la royne d'Angleterre sur les articles du dit traicté par moy ja convenu avec ses dépputez, lui remonstrant qu'elle ne peult moins que de me descharger entièrement de mes offres et ouvertures si elle ne les veult accepter et passer oultre à une prompte exécution d'icelles." She

Mr Froude further states that on the return of Beale from Sheffield, Walsingham cynically remarked that his mistress might go further, and replace Mary Stewart in Scotland. There was in reality no cynicism expressed or implied by Walsingham. He seriously advised Elizabeth to come to terms with the Scottish queen on the conditions she had offered; and we shall find that at a later period he repeated his advice. The chief secretary possessed in an eminent degree the qualities in which his mistress was so glaringly deficient. He was prompt and decided alike in council and in action; and he was no doubt of opinion that, looking at the threatening aspect of affairs both at home and abroad, it was less dangerous to liberate the Scottish queen on the terms she proposed, than either to retain her in captivity or to put her to death. Excepting her most rabid enemies, no one can now doubt the soundness of this opinion.

But instead of listening to his advice, Elizabeth insisted upon him proceeding immediately to Scotland, to repair the mischief she might so easily have prevented. Walsingham was most reluctant to undertake the mission; but his mistress would listen to no excuse, and the secretary arrived in Edinburgh on the 1st of September.

On the discomfiture of the Ruthven conspirators, the Earl of Arran had resumed his ascendancy at Court; and he regarded with just suspicion the un-

also requested Castelnau to ascertain, if possible, the views of Burghley and Walsingham on the subject of the treaty.—Mary to Castelnau, 22d July 1583; Labanoff, v. 358, 359. So far, therefore, from making the revolution in Scotland a pretext for breaking off the treaty, Mary obviously hoped to induce Elizabeth to proceed with it in consequence of that event.

expected visit of the English secretary. The cold reception given to him by James was no doubt the result of the favourite's advice; and when Walsingham, in obedience to his instructions, attempted to point out to the young king the danger of displacing those counsellors who were friendly to Elizabeth, he promptly replied that he was an independent sovereign, and that he would govern his subjects as he thought fit.[1] Satisfied that his mistress had sent him on a fruitless errand, and that James was entirely under the influence of Arran and Colonel Stewart, the secretary remained a very short time in Scotland. But he stayed long enough to sow the seeds of a fresh plot. By means of bribes, administered by Bowes, a new conspiracy was organised to carry off the king. But it was detected by the keen eye of Arran, who took prompt and effective measures to secure the safety of his patron; and although one evening a body of horsemen were seen hovering near Falkland, their leaders did not venture to approach the palace on ascertaining the preparations that had been made for their reception.[2]

James was meanwhile corresponding with the Duke of Guise,[3] who had by this time, in concert with the refugees of Paris, matured his plans. Charles Paget,[4] a brother of the Lord Paget, had been sent over to England in disguise to ascertain the most favourable spot for the landing of the expedition. The coast of Sussex had been first suggested, but on further consideration Lancashire was fixed upon as the most

[1] Walsingham to Elizabeth, 11th September; Record Office.
[2] Tytler, viii. 158.
[3] James to Duke of Guise; Teulet, v. 304. [4] Ibid., 312.

eligible spot. It was one where the invaders would be least expected, and where the bulk of the population was Catholic. It was determined that the Duke de Mayenne, the younger brother of Guise, should effect a landing on the south coast, while he himself should steer for Morecambe Bay[1] with 4000 veterans, to be furnished by the army of the Netherlands. It was calculated that he would there be joined by the leading nobility of the northern counties with a following of 20,000 men.[2] The scheme of the duke, as he himself described it to Charles Paget, was simply to restore the Catholic faith in England, and to place Mary Stewart on the throne, "which belonged to her of right." Having accomplished these objects, he declared on his honour that he would forthwith withdraw all foreign troops from Britain; and if any portion of them refused to obey, he engaged to join the English forces and compel them to retire.[3]

England was probably saved from an invasion at this time by the explanations thus given by the Duke of Guise. A copy of his letter to Paget was sent to Philip by his ambassador in Paris; and as he entertained certain designs upon England himself, he carefully marked the two passages[4] relating to the placing of Mary Stewart on the throne, and the withdrawal of

[1] The point fixed upon was a small rocky island in the parish of Dalton in Furness, called the Pile of Fouldrey, where there was sufficient anchorage for the largest ships.—Teulet, v. 309.

[2] This number was to be made up of 6000 men from the Borders, including the Maxwells and the retainers of Fernihirst; 4000 under the Dacres, 3000 under Northumberland, 1000 under Westmoreland, 1000 under the Earl of Cumberland, 2000 under Lord Wharton, besides the men of Durham, &c.—See Instruccion para Roma, &c.; Teulet, v. 309.

[3] See Instruccion para Inglaterra de 28 de Agosto 1583; Teulet, v. 312.

[4] They are both underlined by Philip's own hand.—Ibid.

the foreign troops immediately after that object was accomplished. Upon both points Philip apparently had serious doubts, and until they were removed he could decide on nothing. Guise was ready to embark. The Earl of Westmoreland, the Dacres, Paget, and the other refugees, were eager to return to their respective counties to raise their tenantry and join in the crusade against the heretic queen. But they looked in vain for the Spanish fleet which was to carry them to England; and Elizabeth escaped a danger of which she had not dreamed, and for which at the time she was wholly unprepared.

The reader will naturally ask how Mary was employed at this critical time. If we are to believe M. Froude, she was, notwithstanding her shattered health, eager only for war. In the words of this popular historian, the Duke of Guise[1] "was reproached *day by day* for his inaction by letters from the Queen of Scots," who is represented as fretting with impatience for the appearance of her kinsman at the head of his invading army, to throw open her prison-gates and place her on her rival's throne.

We have here an instructive example of the mode in which Mr Froude, when at a loss for facts to suit his purpose, supplies them from his imagination. He does not refer his readers even to one of the many reproachful letters which Mary, he says, addressed to her cousin at this time. And he pays a poor compliment to the understanding of the Scottish queen by supposing that she would have preferred the extremely hazardous alternative of an invasion to a peaceful settlement of her differences with Elizabeth. Mary knew well

[1] Vol. xi. 605.

that her life would be placed in imminent peril by the landing of a foreign force in England. She probably felt that as the Duke of Guise was, next to her son, the nearest kinsman she had in the world, she could not reject his proffered aid; but that she sought it in the shape of an invasion and an insurrection, nowhere appears. Still less is there any proof of the outrageous assertion of Mr Froude that she was at this time reproaching her cousin "day by day" for his inaction. So far from this being the case, we believe that not a single letter can be produced from Mary to the Duke of Guise on the subject of the invasion.[1] If Mr Froude has discovered any such, it must be in some repository accessible only to himself, and which he is bound in honour to conceal from the knowledge of his readers.

The absence of any such letters may probably lead us to conclude that the details connected with the invasion were purposely concealed from the Scottish queen. No object could be gained by engaging her in a correspondence on the subject; and considering how closely she was watched, and how frequently her letters were intercepted, the risk of discovery would have been enormously increased. The Duke of Guise was not a conspirator of the Ridolphi class, and he would naturally take care not to involve his cousin in any unnecessary danger. This is not mere matter of conjecture; for we find that some months afterwards several letters of the duke to the Queen of Scots were intercepted, opened, and read by Shrewsbury and Beale. But as no complaint was made as to their contents, we

[1] None are to be found in Labanoff, Teulet, or any other collection of Mary's letters.

may safely conclude that they were wholly silent on the dangerous subject of the invasion.

The persecution of the English Catholics was meanwhile continued with unabated rigour. To entrap the friends and adherents of the Queen of Scots, her enemies had recourse to the most odious devices. Camden states that they did not scruple to counterfeit letters in her name, and to send them by some unknown hand to the houses of the Catholic gentry; while spies and informers found their way into every society, and reported with due exaggeration any unguarded words that might fall from an unsuspecting host. Arden, a gentlemen of ancient family in Warwickshire, seems to have fallen a victim to these devices. He had incurred the enmity of the Lord of Kenilworth by speaking of him as an upstart and an adulterer;[1] and at Leicester's instigation he was arrested, tried, and executed for treason upon the evidence of a friend, who when upon the rack admitted in his agony that he had heard Arden say he wished the queen was in heaven. A son-in-law of Arden named Somerville, who appears to have been insane, was sent to Newgate on the same charge, and was soon afterwards found strangled in his cell.[2] A more important victim was Francis Throgmorton, a nephew of the celebrated Sir Nicolas. Both his father and his uncle had all along favoured the claims of the Queen of Scots, and Francis was at this time one of the most enthusiastic of her English adherents. He was in all the secrets of the Paris refugees; and upon his arrest at his house in London, clear evidence was found of their plans and of the intended invasion of the Duke of Guise.[3]

[1] Camden, 257. [2] Ibid., 257. [3] Ibid., 261.

In consequence of this alarming discovery, and of confessions extorted from him on the rack, which, however, he retracted before his execution, innumerable fresh arrests were made. Northumberland, the brother of the attainted earl, was sent to the Tower; and whether he died there by his own hand or by that of an assassin, is still a matter of dispute.[1] The Earl of Arundel, eldest son of the late Duke of Norfolk, was also arrested; and he died in the Tower after a rigorous imprisonment of eleven years.[2] A fresh sacrifice of priests was, under the circumstances, deemed expedient. Seven were accordingly selected for the purpose, who, after being duly tortured, were first hung and then disembowelled alive in the presence of an admiring crowd of orthodox spectators.[3]

Mendoza, who, according to the custom of the age, had taken advantage of his position as ambassador to foment intrigues against the sovereign to whom he was accredited, had been seriously compromised by the confessions of Throgmorton. Elizabeth's ministers, who had systematically practised the same disreputable devices in France, in Scotland, and in the Netherlands, were, or affected to be, extremely indignant at the discovery. Mendoza was summoned to attend the Council, where a scene ensued of a still more stormy character than that which had preceded the departure of his predecessor. After mutual recriminations of the bitterest kind, the ambassador demanded his passports, declaring as he took his leave that, as they were not satisfied with him as a minister of peace, they should soon have an opportunity of testing his

[1] See note in Lingard, vi. 192; and reply of Froude, xii. 116, note.
[2] Lingard, vi. 192.
[3] Froude, xi. 619.

qualities as a minister of war.[1] He immediately set out for Paris, where he resided for many years, ever ready to aid to the utmost of his power in any scheme for the overthrow of Elizabeth.

Her ministers were at this time practising in Scotland the very same devices which they had condemned so loudly in Mendoza. They were instigating Angus and Mar to overthrow the favourite, and once more make a prisoner of the king. Gowrie, who had been a conspirator since the days of Riccio's murder, could not resist the temptation of a fresh plot. In order the better to deceive the king, who had granted him a full pardon for his share in "the Raid of Ruthven," he obtained a licence to go abroad. But he delayed his journey under one pretext or another, while he was secretly arranging with his confederates the plan of the insurrection. But the new favourite was a man of a very different stamp from his predecessor Aubigny. He had gained, through the treachery of some of the conspirators, a full knowledge of their plans; and he not only prepared to meet them, but he privately sent a message to Elizabeth assuring her that she was the dupe of men whose resolutions changed from month to month, and who were traitors to each other as well as to their prince.[2] Thus warned, Elizabeth refused to commit herself in writing to the conspirators, though earnestly entreated to do so. Arran had determined not to interfere until they had placed themselves in his power by some overt act of

[1] Mignet, ii. 137, who quotes Mendoza's despatch preserved at Simancas.

[2] Letter of John Colville to his brother, 16th April 1584; Record Office.

treason. Having privately desired his friends to hold themselves in readiness, he remained quietly at Falkland with the king, until he ascertained that Angus, Mar, and Glammis had entered Stirling with a body of horse, and taken possession of the castle. He then despatched Colonel Stewart with a hundred troopers to arrest the real chief of the conspiracy, Gowrie, who was at his house at Dundee. After some resistance on the part of his retainers, the earl was captured and sent a prisoner to Edinburgh. Arran now called on his adherents to take the field, and no less than twelve thousand men obeyed the summons. At the head of this force, the king prepared to march against the rebels at Stirling. But their plans had been completely disconcerted by the promptitude of Arran. The unexpected arrest of Gowrie, and the numbers and the loyalty of their opponents, left them no alternative between submission and flight. They chose the safer course; and accompanied by several of the clergy, their accomplices in rebellion and their consolers in defeat,[1] they made the best of their way to Newcastle, where, some twenty years before, first Murray and then Morton had fled, like them to escape the penalties of treason. Elizabeth treated the fugitives precisely as she had treated their predecessors; she had abetted them in their rebellion, and when they failed she cast them off.

Mr Froude, who seems to entertain an unconquerable antipathy to every one bearing the name of

[1] Angus and his friends were accompanied in their flight by Andrew Melvill and others of the clergy, who ministered to the spiritual wants of their noble patrons in their exile. Angus, who was still a young man of two or three and twenty, seems to have been especially attentive to his religious duties.—See Burton, History of Scotland, v. 487.

Stewart, with the sole exception of the Regent Murray, informs his readers that after the rebels fled from Stirling the Earl of Gowrie was arraigned before a court extemporised for his trial, of "which Colonel Stewart,[1] who had taken him prisoner, was president." This is an unaccountable mistake; for so far from presiding at Gowrie's trial, Stewart's name does not once occur in either of the two contemporary reports which remain of the proceedings. According to these he was neither on the bench nor on the jury, nor even a witness in the case.[2]

As to Gowrie's guilt there can be no question, and he met his fate with the resolution of a man who had passed his life in the midst of danger. Anticipating the decision of the jury, he called for a cup of wine when they retired to consider their verdict, and bade his attendants conceal the news of his death from his wife, who had just been confined of her thirteenth child. He was beheaded on the day of his trial, declaring, like his old accomplice Morton, that he was guiltless of the crime for which he suffered.[3]

Some two years before Gowrie's death, the English ambassador, Sir Robert Bowes, discovered that the famous casket containing the letters and sonnets alleged to have been written by the Queen of Scots was in the earl's hands. Elizabeth expressed a strong desire to obtain possession of them, no doubt with the

[1] Hist., xi. 648.

[2] We have two reports of Gowrie's trial, one in Pitcairn's Criminal Trials, and another in the Cotton Library, by an eyewitness, and printed in the Bannatyne Miscellany. According to both of these, John Graham, Justice-Clerk, was the presiding judge, and the Earl of Arran was on the jury; but no mention is made of Colonel Stewart.

[3] Cotton MSS.; Calig., c. viii. 24.

view, should an occasion arise, of reviving the old scandals against Mary. But Gowrie positively refused to part with the casket[1] and its contents. Bowes tried bribes and promises in vain, but Gowrie, like his old confederates Murray and Morton, stuck resolutely to the casket. They had all been ready enough to sell anything else, their country and themselves included, but nothing would induce them to part with what they chose to call the proofs of their sovereign's guilt, but which even at this distance of time can be shown to be a mass of ill-concocted forgeries. This is the last authentic reference which we possess as to the history of those famous documents. We have no evidence that they were in existence after Gowrie's death. Whether they were eventually destroyed by him, or whether, as the enemies of the queen insinuate, they were destroyed by her son, are matters of pure conjecture, upon which much ingenuity has been wasted, without the smallest practical result.

[1] See the Bowes Correspondence, p. 236, 240, 253, 264.

CHAPTER XXII.

ARRAN AND THE MASTER OF GRAY.

THE soldier of fortune who by his own unaided energies had now become virtually master of Scotland, soon discovered that he was an object of general envy and distrust. Mary, as well as Elizabeth, regarded him with avowed suspicion; and the diplomatists both of France and England held aloof from a man whose character and objects were still but partially developed, and who, they knew, was not to be purchased except at his own price. He was hated by the nobles, who affected to regard him as an upstart; and he was reviled by the clergy, because, although a Protestant by birth and connections, he was the first man in Scotland who after the Reformation attempted to curb their insolence and curtail their power.[1] They revenged themselves as might have been expected, by

[1] A Parliament was summoned immediately after Gowrie's death, in which the authority of the king was declared supreme in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as temporal. No person of whatever quality or profession was to presume, under heavy penalties, to utter any slanderous words against the king or any member of the Council. All ecclesiastical assemblies, general or provincial, were prohibited from meeting, and the whole spiritual jurisdiction was declared to be vested in the bishops.—See Tytler, viii. 177.

loading him with every kind of abuse. They denounced him as a profligate, a tyrant, and an atheist.[1] But his profligacy consisted in marrying the Countess of March, who had divorced her husband for a very sufficient cause.[2] His tyranny meant that he had reduced the entire kingdom to obedience, and his atheism that he preferred Episcopacy to Presbyterianism, and resolutely resisted the pretensions of the Kirk to interfere in the affairs of State. That like other political adventurers in that age, Arran was greedy of power and riches, and somewhat unscrupulous as to the means by which he obtained them, may be assumed; but he is not charged with any such crimes as the surrender and sale of Northumberland by Mar and Morton, and their still more infamous offer to murder their queen for a sufficient bribe. Nor was he, like Murray and Lennox, a traitor to the sovereign who had raised them from the dust. Whatever may have been his errors or his crimes, no one has alleged that Arran was unfaithful to the prince to whom he owed his elevation.

The favourite was well aware of the dangers by which he was surrounded. Although, with the death of Gowrie, all active opposition to his government had ceased, he saw that without foreign aid he could not hope to consolidate his power; and as his chief enemies, Angus, Mar, and the Hamiltons, had taken refuge in England, where they were secretly supported by Elizabeth, he naturally, in the first instance, turned to France. About the time of Gowrie's capture, he accordingly sent Lord Seton on a special mission to Henry the Third. Seton was desired to remind the

[1] Calderwood, vols. iii. and iv. Robertson, iii. 403.

French king of the ancient alliance between the two crowns, which dated from the days of Charlemagne; of the services which in times past Scotland had rendered to his ancestors; of the friendless position of the young King of Scots, who even in his mother's womb had been the sport of rival factions;—and, in conclusion, he referred to the very critical situation in which his mother was now placed, and for whom, the envoy added, "her son was not only willing to sacrifice everything he had in the world, but even his life."[1]

It is highly probable that Seton exceeded his instructions in thus warmly advocating the cause of the imprisoned queen, for Arran could not at this time have seriously desired her restoration. But in Castelnau, Seton now found an energetic supporter of his mistress. On his first arrival in England the French ambassador had taken comparatively little interest in her fortunes; but his long-continued correspondence with Mary had taught him to form the highest estimate of her character and conduct, and he made no secret of his opinion.[2] The zeal with which upon every occasion he spoke on her behalf at length provoked the jealousy of the queen-mother. She even took occasion to remind him of his instructions,[3] which were, it seems at this time, simply to see

[1] See Marie Stuart et Catherine de Medicis, par Cheruel, p. 115. Mr Tytler does not appear to have been aware of this mission of Lord Seton.

[2] "Je ne sache pas," he said, writing to the Archbishop of St Andrews (Patrick Adamson), "cœur au monde qui ne dût être ému à lui vouloir bien pour sa vertu et prudence et patience."—See Cheruel, 112.

[3] "Pour le regard de la reine d'Ecosse, ma belle fille, vous savez la charge que le roi mon segneur et fils vous a toujours donnée et moi aussi, *de faire pour elle les affaires de son douaire tout ce que pourrez et pour intercéder aussi envers la reine d'Angleterre, à ce qu'elle reçût bon traitement et commodité de sa personne.* Aussi, nous assurons nous

that her dower was duly paid, and that she was honourably treated by the Queen of England. To seek the relief of her daughter-in-law from captivity was, in Catherine's opinion, no part of the duty of the ambassador; and Henry, now more than ever the tool of his mother, was too glad to escape the responsibility of ruling his distracted kingdom to interfere. It is hardly necessary to say that the cold and pusillanimous diplomacy of Catherine and her son had a most disastrous effect upon the Scottish queen, for it encouraged her enemies to proceed to all extremities against her. Had Castelnau been energetically supported by the Court of France at this time, Elizabeth would have found it impossible to resist any longer the demand of Mary for her liberty.

Certain vague promises were meanwhile made to Seton, and Catherine proposed a French marriage for the King of Scots; but both he and Arran wanted money, and Henry, impoverished by his reckless extravagance, had none to give. It was in vain that Castelnau sought to impress upon Catherine and her son the importance of preserving the old alliance with Scotland.[1] The embassy of Seton led to no result, except to convince Arran that no substantial aid was to be obtained from France; and he resolved, without loss of time, to try his fortune in another quarter.

Elizabeth was still inclined to regard as her enemy

que vous n'y avez rien omis, et que vous n'avez *excédé l'intention du roi mon seigneur et fils et de moi*, qui suis d'avis que vous leviez à la dite dame reine d'Angleterre l'opinion qu'elle a de vous au contraire."—Catherine to Castelnau, of May 1584; Cheruel, 113.

[1] "Je suis et serai toujours d'opinion qu'il n'y a nulle alliance au monde que la France doive avoir plus chère que celle de ce petit pays d'Ecosse."—See Cheruel, 111.

the man who had brought Morton to the block; and Walsingham, ever the advocate of decided measures, recommended her, instead of listening to the overtures of Arran, to furnish the exiled lords in England with men and money sufficient to enable them to overthrow the favourite. Burghley, on the other hand,[1] was inclined to treat with Arran, or at least to listen to his offers, before resorting to force; and Elizabeth finally adopted his opinion. She had sent Davison to Scotland shortly after Gowrie's execution, and he had found both Arran and the king determinedly opposed to the restoration of the rebel lords. Davison further informed his mistress that he was satisfied that James and his mother were at this time on the most friendly footing; that he ever spoke of her in terms of respectful affection; and that, in short, although she was a prisoner in England, her influence over her son as well as his chief nobility was still as great as ever.[2]

This alarming intelligence at length induced Elizabeth to consent to treat with Arran; and it was finally arranged that he should have an interview with Lord Hunsdon on the Border. Foulden Kirk, near Berwick, was the place appointed for the meeting; and, on the 14th of August, Arran arrived there at the head of an immense retinue,[3] among whom were various of the leading nobles of his faction. The two representatives of their respective sovereigns alone entered the church, and Hunsdon appears to have formed a very favourable opinion of Arran, who no doubt did his best to gain the confidence of Elizabeth's cousin.

[1] Instructions to Lord Hunsdon; Record Office, June 30, 1584.

[2] Davison to Walsingham, May 28; Record Office.

[3] "His retinue amounted to five thousand horse, and he was attended by five members of the Privy Council."—Tytler, viii. 192.

"If I can judge of a wise man," he wrote to Lord Burghley, "I think him one, and one of the best tongues that I have heard. He has a princely presence; Latin is rife with him, and sometimes Greek."[1]

The principal subject of discussion between them was the restoration of the exiled lords in England; and Hunsdon, in obedience to his instructions, strongly recommended that they should be pardoned. But Arran replied that for the present this was impossible, as he had clear proof that they were even then plotting against his life, and devising new schemes to regain possession of the young king. With regard to his mother, not a word appears to have been said; for Hunsdon had no instructions on the subject, and Arran was not in favour of her restoration, which would certainly have entailed upon him the loss of the Hamilton estates. But although Hunsdon interceded for the exiled lords in vain, the two noblemen parted on the best terms, and with profound and probably sincere professions on the part of Arran of amity to the Queen of England.

During the interview, which lasted upwards of five hours, the attendants of both lords had remained outside the church, and it was observed that both seemed highly satisfied with the result.[2] Before they parted, Arran introduced to Lord Hunsdon a young man,

[1] Hunsdon to Burghley, 14th August; Record Office. A nephew of Burghley who accompanied Hunsdon spoke of Arran in nearly the same terms: "For the man surely he carrieth a princely presence and gait, goodly of personage, representing a brave countenance of a captain of middle age, very resolute, very wise and learned, and one of the best-spoken men that ever I heard—a man worthy the queen's favour if it please her."—Sir Edward Hoby to Lord Burghley, 15th August; Record Office.

[2] Sir Edward Hoby to Dr Parry, 15th August; Record Office.

whose singularly handsome person and pleasing manners could not fail to attract attention wherever he appeared. But never did nature play a more fantastic trick than when she fashioned this model of manly beauty; for, fruitful in wickedness though Scotland was, she produced in this age no more consummate scoundrel than the Master of Gray.[1] Born and bred a Catholic, he had, like many of his countrymen, spent some years in France. Professing the utmost devotion to the cause of Mary, he had won the confidence of the Duke of Guise and her other partisans in Paris, who not only intrusted him with all their secrets, but loaded him with presents when he took his departure.[2] On his arrival in Scotland he found that Arran was supreme; but being well received by the young king, to whom a handsome person and lively manners were ever the best recommendation, it is probable that Gray soon formed the design of supplanting the favourite. At the present time he affected to regard him as his patron; and although Arran, with his varied experience of men, may have more than half suspected his profuse expressions of fidelity, he had too much reliance on himself to exhibit any jealousy of a youth who seemed better fitted, from his years and his appearance, to be a lady's page, than a rival in the deep and dangerous game which he had hitherto played with such uninterrupted success.

Gray was the bearer of a private letter from the

[1] The eldest son of Lord Gray.

[2] "He hath himself confessed to have had at his coming out of France a cupboard of plate given him by the Spanish ambassador resident there, to the value of five or six thousand crowns, besides other gifts from the Duke of Guise, and other of the queen's friends."—Davison to Hatton, 6th Sept. 1584; Harl. MS., No. 291, f. 143.

king to Lord Hunsdon, which he must have taken an opportunity of presenting without the knowledge of Arran. From its contents, which Hunsdon imparted next day to Lord Burghley, we learn the important fact that both Gray and his master were prepared at this time to betray the cause of the unhappy queen; and that James had opened this clandestine correspondence with the English ministers at the instigation of his new favourite it is impossible to doubt. In this letter Hunsdon was informed that Gray was in possession of certain secrets respecting the designs of the English refugees against Elizabeth, but that, as he was about to be sent as ambassador to London, he would himself disclose them to her ministers. Hunsdon lost no time in communicating this unexpected intelligence to Burghley. He described Gray to the lord treasurer as "very young, but wise and discreet. He is no doubt very inward with the Scottish queen, and all her affairs, both in England and France; yea, with the Pope, for he is accounted a Papist. I have written to Mr Secretary (Walsingham) for a safe-conduct to him; *but nothing of the cause of his coming*, but only to her majesty and to your lordship. If Mr Secretary be slow for this safe-conduct, I pray your lordship further it, for the matter requires no delay."[1] Burghley and his mistress were therefore alone acquainted with the secret of Gray's meditated treachery.

In the course of this summer a M. Maron[2] arrived from France on business connected with the property of the Queen of Scots. But he was not allowed to

[1] Hunsdon to Burghley, 14th August; Record Office.

[2] Mr Froude calls him "Mason," xi. 655.

proceed to Sheffield Castle alone. William Wade, a member of the Council, was sent along with him, under the pretence of reopening the endless negotiations for the liberty of Mary, but in reality to play the part of spy. Wade had just returned from Madrid, whither Elizabeth, alarmed at the consequences that might ensue from the expulsion of Mendoza, had sent him with an explanation of her conduct. But Philip refused even to see her envoy; and he seems to have vented his chagrin on the prisoner of Sheffield Castle, whom he perhaps regarded as Philip's representative in England, and whom he seems to have treated with studied rudeness. Mary resented his insolence with becoming spirit, and complained that during his visit he had intercepted and detained her letters. Some of these, we know, were from her cousin the Duke of Guise; and if they had contained any matter implicating her, they would certainly have been preserved. As both Wade and Shrewsbury were silent[1] on the subject, we may conclude that they had exercised their curiosity in vain.

After Wade's departure, Beale reappeared again with fresh proposals; and Mr Froude is seriously of opinion that Elizabeth and her Council were at last in earnest, and that Mary might have obtained her liberty on advantageous terms. But by this time she had heard of Gowrie's overthrow, and of the flight of his accomplices to England. She now, according to Mr Froude, anticipated a speedy triumph over her enemies. "The one absorbing hope of her life was to see those who had humbled her rolling, all of them, in the dust at

[1] See Wade and Shrewsbury's report; Record Office—Mary Queen of Scots. Froude, xi. 658.

her feet. The least gleam of success she construed into a turn of the tide; and the news of the defeat and flight of the confederates, and the execution of Gowrie, scattered her despondency and filled her with dreams of coming triumph." He represents her, in fact, as so elated with her prospects at this time, that "Elizabeth might as well have abdicated as have yielded" to her demands.

At the risk of wearying the reader with the subject of these interminable negotiations, we shall briefly state, in Mary's own words, the substance of what passed between her and Beale on this occasion. "The result," she says, "of my negotiations with Beale, is a proposal on his part to renew the treaty of last year, with two fresh conditions: the first, that I intercede with my son on behalf of the lords who have fled to England, so that they may be pardoned and restored; the second, that I write to the Duke of Guise, the Archbishop of Glasgow, and the Bishop of Ross, to abandon any enterprise they may have in hand against the Queen of England. I have agreed to everything, with this sole condition, that the two fresh stipulations shall be regarded as accessory to and dependent upon the execution of the treaty; and that, with regard to my liberty, I should prefer to reside out of England; or if I remained here, that more favourable terms should be offered than those proposed last year."[1] After the systematic duplicity with which she had been treated, Mary was certainly justified in insisting upon these very reasonable conditions. But they did not suit the views of Elizabeth. She probably hoped, through Mary's means, to obtain the restoration of the

[1] See her letter to Castelnau of 22d May; Labanoff, v. 477.

exiled lords; and having accomplished her object and restored the English influence in Scotland, she could easily find some fresh pretext for breaking off the treaty. Mary had been entrapped on other occasions by similar devices, and because she was now upon her guard, Elizabeth accused her of bad faith.[1] Thus ended the last of negotiations between the Queen of Scots and Beale. The next time they met was at Fotheringay, whither he was sent to announce that sentence of death had been passed upon her.

On the 10th of June of this year died Elizabeth's worthless suitor, the Duke of Alençon; and exactly one month later, the Prince of Orange was assassinated by a youthful fanatic, who saw in the hero of the Netherlands revolt the arch-enemy of his religion. A thrill of horror shot through Protestant Europe when the tidings of the murder spread abroad; and loud and deep were the denunciations against the Papists, who were everywhere supposed to have approved of the crime. In the fierce controversy which was raging far and wide between the old religion and the new, the belief was natural. But to this sweeping charge the Catholics might reply that it was not they who commenced the horrid practice of secret murder, and that Cardinal Beaton, David Riccio, and the Duke of Guise all fell by the hands of Protestant assassins. They might add that Knox exulted quite as much over those victims of religious zeal as Philip did over the murder of William the Silent. The death of that great man was mourned as an irreparable loss by his struggling countrymen, and was productive of important consequences as well to them as to the neighbouring States.

[1] Elizabeth to Mary; Record Office.

The Earl of Shrewsbury had been intrusted with the custody of the Queen of Scots for upwards of fourteen years, and he now earnestly desired to be relieved of his charge. In addition to the heavy responsibility of guarding his prisoner, he was involved at this time in a series of domestic broils, which rendered him the most miserable of men.[1] His wife, a scheming, avaricious, and malignant woman, had, during the first years of her imprisonment, paid assiduous court to the Scottish queen, and Mary had undertaken the education of one of her granddaughters, who became her constant companion for many years.[2] But

[1] In a letter to Leicester, the earl describes some of his domestic grievances in the following terms: "For my son (Gilbert Talbot), I never dissuaded him from loving his wife, though he hath said he must either forsake me or hate his wife; this he gives out, which is false and untrue. This I think is his duty,—that seeing I have forbad him for coming to *my wicked and malicious wife*, who hath set me at naught in his own hearing, that contrary to my commandment hath both gone and sent unto her daily by his wife's persuasion; yea, and hath both written and carried letters to no mean personages in my wife's behalf. These ill dealings would he have salved by indirect reports, for in my life did I never seek their separation, for the best ways I have to content myself is to think it is *his wife's wicked persuasion* and her mother's together, for I think neither barrel better herring of them both."—August 8, 1584; Lodge, ii. 244.

[2] A letter from Mary to her young friend has been preserved. It is as follows:—

13th September 1583.

"MIGNONE,—J'ay rescu vostre lettre et bons tokens, desquels je vous remercie. Je suis bien ayse que vous portez si bien; demeurez avèques vostre père et mère hardiment ceste saison qu'il vous veullent retenir, car l'ayr et la saison sont si fascheus issi que j'é desjà bien sentu le change de l'ayr de Worsopp ou je ne marchois plus, mays je n'é layssée à commander à mes jambes. Recommandé moy à vostre père et mère bien affectionnement, et à vostre sœur, et à toutes mes connaissances, si il y en a. Je vous feray fayre vostre robe noyre et la vous envoirez, aussitost que je pourray avoir la garniture que j'é mandée à Londres. Voilà tout ce que je vous puis mander pour ceste fois, sinon vous envoyer aultant de bénédictions qu'il i a de jours en l'an, priant Dieu que la sienne ce puisse estendre sur vous et les vostres pour

a marriage between Elizabeth Cavendish, a daughter of the countess by her first husband, and Lord Henry Lennox, a younger brother of Darnley, in the year 1580, seems to have eventually caused a complete breach between the Queen of Scots and the wife of her keeper. Lord Henry and his wife both died soon after their marriage, leaving an only child, the unfortunate Arabella Stewart; and Lady Shrewsbury, ever on the watch for the aggrandisement of her family, began to cherish the notion that her granddaughter Arabella, being descended of royal blood by the father's side, and born in England, was the true heir of Elizabeth, in preference to Mary or her son, who were both aliens by birth. But she was not content with indulging in secret these dreams of future greatness. She sought to hasten the period of their fulfilment by spreading reports of an adulterous intimacy between her husband and the Queen of Scots. The readiness with which this fresh scandal was caught up by her enemies need not surprise us. We have seen that Burghley did not hesitate, some eighteen years before,[1] to impose upon the French ambassador a grossly false and scandalous account of Riccio's murder. To send abroad the story of Lady Shrewsbury was much more justifiable; and it gained, according to Castelnau, a very rapid circulation. It was told, no doubt with due exaggerations, to the Spanish ambassador, to the foreign bankers in London, that they might transmit it to their respective countries; and to every one, in short, whether Protestant

jamais. En haste, ce 13 de Septembre, vostre bien affectionnée maystresse et meilleure amye, Marie R. To my weilbeloved bedfallow, Bess Pierpont."—Labanoff, v. 370.

[1] *Ante*, p. 78, note.

or Catholic, who was likely to aid in spreading the scandal.[1]

The sequel is soon told. On hearing of the stories circulated by Lady Shrewsbury, Mary wrote both to Elizabeth and to the French ambassador demanding an immediate inquiry. But as the scandal was to the last degree gratifying to her enemies, it is probable that she would have complained in vain had not Lord Shrewsbury had an equal interest in exposing the falsehood and malice of his wife. Burghley could have found a hundred pretexts for evading the demands of Mary; but as a peer of the realm, and a peer of the highest rank, Shrewsbury insisted upon a full and searching investigation. Various attempts were made to evade the inquiry, but Shrewsbury was resolute; and after much vexatious delay, the countess, and her two sons by her first marriage, who had aided her in circulating the scandal, were summoned before the Council. They there confessed upon their knees, with many expressions of penitence, that they were slanderers and liars,[2] and that the ridiculous story, which from the vilest motives they had spread abroad, was entirely an invention of their own.

It would have been well if the matter had ended

[1] "On l'a dit à l'ambassadeur d'Espagne, on l'a dit aussi à l'évêque de Saint André, qui m'en a fait plainte; on l'a dit aux banquiers et étrangers pour le mander partout, semant cela parmi les catholiques et les protestants pour vous décrier envers eux. C'est le dernier venin que vos ennemis se sont réservé, n'ayant pu empoisonner votre corps d'envenimer votre reputation."—Castelnau to Mary Stewart, quoted by Cheruel, p. 107, from Bibl. Imp. Coll. Bréquigny, t. 97.

[2] Record Office. It appears that the scandal had spread to Italy. See letter of Anthony Standen, who had been a retainer of Darnley, to the Queen of Scots, dated Florence, 12th October 1584; Labanoff, vii. 162.

here. But it appears that in her correspondence with Elizabeth, Mary had informed the English queen that the Countess of Shrewsbury had spoken of her as well as of herself in the most offensive terms. Elizabeth was eager to know the particulars; and it is said that Mary, not unwilling to revenge herself upon two women both of whom had certainly given her abundant cause of provocation, minutely detailed all that the one had said of the other. It appears that in her conversations with Mary, Lady Shrewsbury had told the most scandalous tales respecting Elizabeth's intimacies not only with Leicester, but with Sir Christopher Hatton, the Duke of Alençon, and others. In a letter to Elizabeth—written, she says, at her desire—Mary repeats all these details, with others of an equally remarkable kind; but that it never reached the hands of the English queen seems to be undisputed. Whether it was ever sent is a matter of more uncertainty. The letter, which is preserved at Hatfield, is stated by Prince Labanoff to be in the handwriting[1] of Mary; but from the fact of its bearing no date,[2] as well as from the silence of contemporary writers respecting it, he thinks it highly probable that it was never sent. The letter may have been written when she was indignant on the one hand at the abominable conduct of Lady Shrewsbury, and on the other at the systematic duplicity of Elizabeth in evading the execution of the treaty. But upon reflection, Mary could hardly fail to perceive that such a letter could never be forgiven by her rival. It may therefore have

[1] See Labanoff, vi. 50.

[2] Very few of Mary's letters are undated.—See Labanoff's collection, *passim*.

been thrown aside, and seized, along with all her other papers, when some eighteen months afterwards she was removed from Chartley to Fotheringay. This would account for the possession of the letter by Lord Burghley and its preservation at Hatfield.

On his first appearance at Court after he had resigned his charge, Elizabeth, ever full of curiosity respecting her prisoner, inquired of Shrewsbury his true opinion of Mary, and in particular whether her word could be relied on. Shrewsbury, afraid apparently of offending his mistress by saying anything in praise of her rival, at first evaded the question; but Elizabeth having insisted in her own peremptory way upon having an answer, he replied that if the Queen of Scots gave her promise upon anything she would not break it.[1] Elizabeth, who never kept a promise in her life, heard Shrewsbury's reply in silence. But it seems to have made a decided impression; for we learn that some days afterwards, on being asked to supply money for the use of some of the seditious clergy who had fled to England with Angus and Mar, she said she would rather trust the Queen of Scotland than embroil herself any more with any of their factions, for they promised everything and did nothing.[2]

It may appear paradoxical to assert that the best friend of Mary in England at this time was Elizabeth. But this seems not only to have been the case, but Mary herself seems to have been aware of it. Although she had frequently and most justly complained of the treatment she had received during her long captivity,

[1] "Qu'il estimoict que sy la dicte royne d'Escosse luy promettoit quelque chose elle ne voldroict violler sa parolle."—Cheruel, Appendix, 339; Castelnau to Henry III., 22d October 1584.

[2] Cheruel, Appendix, 340.

she was induced again and again to place her chief reliance on the friendship of her kinswoman. And it is curious to find that about the time when Elizabeth was declaring that she would rather trust the Queen of Scots than any of the Scottish factions, Mary expressed herself in very similar terms of Elizabeth. In the autumn of this year Mary bade farewell to Sheffield Castle. Sir Ralph Sadler and John Somers, a diplomatist with whom she had been acquainted in her early days in France, had been appointed jointly to the office which Shrewsbury had resigned; and she accompanied her new keepers to Wingfield Manor, which she had occupied for a short time fifteen years before. During the journey, which was performed on horseback, she conversed freely with Somers on her past history and future prospects. She spoke with the utmost affection of her son, in whom she reposed unbounded confidence, and who of late had promised to be guided in everything by her. But she added that she had no wish to take his place and resume the government of Scotland. If she had her liberty, although she desired to revisit her native country and to see her son once more, she had no wish to take upon herself again the cares of royalty, but would spend the remainder of her days in retirement with her relatives in France.[1] It is evident, from the confident terms in which she spoke of the affection of her son, that she had not the faintest suspicion at this time of the treachery of Gray, and of the secret overtures which he and James had made through Lord Hunsdon to Burghley.

Referring to this conversation between the Queen of

[1] Sadler's State Papers, ii. 389.

Scots and Somers, Mr Froude has expressed himself as follows: "She assured Somers, who was associated with Sadler in the charge of her, that she never heard of any enterprise intended upon the realm for her relief, nor as God should have her soul would she ever consent to anything that should trouble the State of which with all her heart she sought the quiet. In the midst of the negotiations which on these assurances had been opened in good faith for her release, she wrote by a sure hand to Sir Francis Englefield, in Spain, bidding him tell the Pope and Philip that she expected nothing from the treaty, but that in any case she desired the execution of the great plot and designment to go forward without respect of peril or danger to herself," &c.[1]

In the first place, Mr Froude has misled his readers as to the purport of the words he has quoted; and secondly, he has quoted them incorrectly. At the commencement of the conversation, Somers had informed Mary, as he says, that "an enterprise in England, tending for her liberty and increasing of her son's greatness, and so meant to come to her, hath both greatly offended her majesty and given her cause to think that she, the Scottish queen, is a party to that enterprise, whatsoever it is." Somers obviously referred to the rumour of some recent plot, and Mary replied, "*As to the enterprise you spoke of*, by my truth I knew not, nor heard anything of it," &c.[2] These were her words, according to the report of Somers. But by misquoting them Mr Froude has put into the queen's mouth a ridiculous falsehood. Instead of saying that she had never heard of the particular enterprise referred to by Somers, he makes her say, in general terms, she had

[1] Froude, xii. 39. [2] See letter of Somers; Sadler, ii. 389, 390.

never heard of *any enterprise* intended for her relief —as if both she and Somers had forgotten the rising of the northern lords, the conspiracy of Norfolk, and the various other attempts made on her behalf since her arrival in England.

Mr Froude has misled his readers upon another point. He would have them believe that at the time Mary was expressing herself in the most friendly terms to Somers, she was urging her partisans abroad to proceed with the execution of the great plot—namely, the invasion of England; and in proof of her duplicity, he refers to an alleged letter of Mary to Sir Francis Englefield, the date of which he does not give. But the letter, if written by Mary at all, was written upwards of two months after her conversation with Somers. It was on the 2d of September that she rode from Sheffield to Wingfield; the date of her alleged letter to Sir Francis Englefield was the 9th of November.

This letter, which is preserved in the Record Office in cipher, is said to have been intercepted; but as it is wholly inconsistent with the genuine letters written by Mary at this time, we are justified in suspecting that it was a fabrication of her enemies. We have undoubted proof that at the time when it purports to have been written she was, instead of despairing of the completion of the treaty, expressing to her most intimate friends a confident hope of the final success of the negotiations.

For some time past Walsingham had employed a person named Thomas Philipps[1] to intercept the correspondence of Mary and her friends. This man was

[1] Philipps appears to have been first employed in 1583.—See Record Office.

extremely expert in the art of deciphering; and as we have abundant proof that at a later period he tampered with the letters of the Scottish Queen, it is by no means improbable that the letter to Sir Francis Englefield is of his composition. Walsingham employed another important agent at this time to pry into the secrets of Mary's correspondence. This was Cherelles,[1] one of the secretaries of the French ambassador, who had sold himself to the English minister, and who supplied him from time to time with copies of the most important letters which passed to and from the Queen of Scots. Another agent of Walsingham at this time was the notorious Archibald Douglas. He had fled from Scotland, as we have seen, at the time of the arrest of his kinsman Morton, or he would certainly have shared his fate as an accomplice in the murder of Darnley. After his arrival in England he had professed himself a devoted partisan of Mary, but he was at this time in the pay of Walsingham. Douglas was an adept in forging and interpolating[2] letters, and therefore a most useful instrument in the hands of his employers.

At the present time Elizabeth seemed once more inclined to treat with her prisoner; but whether through accident or design, some fresh pretext was ever found for arresting the progress of the negotiations. It happened that in the autumn of this year Chrichton the Jesuit was captured while on a voyage to Scotland, and it is said that he was seen at the time to tear up a paper and throw the pieces into the

[1] Labanoff, vi. 26.

[2] See an instance in Labanoff, vi. 21, 22. Mary, in a letter to the Master of Gray, had warned him to beware of Archibald Douglas, but he inserted another name instead.

sea. Wonderful to relate, they were fished up again, and, being pasted together, were found to contain a plan for the invasion of England by the Duke of Guise. Such is the story which was told; and Chrichton, although Elizabeth was at peace with Scotland, was forthwith sent to the Tower, where on the rack he confessed whatever his tormentors wished.[1] The enemies of Mary once more sounded the alarm, and declared that the time had come when some additional precautions should be taken for the security of Elizabeth, whose life was thus exposed to a continued succession of conspiracies and plots.

There was nothing to justify this fresh outcry, for the papers found upon Chrichton, admitting them to be genuine, only told what was well known before. But as a new Parliament was about to meet in the autumn of this year, the enemies of Mary deemed the capture of the Jesuit a fitting prelude to the adoption of fresh measures of hostility against her. A bond of association was accordingly drawn up, it is said by Leicester, and adopted by the Council, the object of which was not only to exclude from the succession any person *by whom or for whom* any conspiracy against the life of Elizabeth was undertaken, but the subscribers bound themselves "in the presence of the eternal God, to prosecute such person or persons to the death."[2] This remarkable document, which was plainly intended to render the Queen of Scots responsible for the acts of others, even though committed without her knowledge, was signed by most of the principal nobility and gentry of England; by her enemies, because they sought her life; and by her friends, because their refu-

[1] Sadler, ii. 401. [2] See the Association in Murdin, 548.

sal might have involved them in unknown penalties and persecutions.

On the meeting of Parliament in December, this Bond of Association was embodied in a bill, but before passing both Houses it underwent several important alterations. The objectionable clause, which would have rendered Mary responsible for the acts of others, was struck out; and it was provided instead, that *any person* charged with plotting against the queen's life might be tried by a court of twenty-four commissioners to be named by the Crown. The sole object of the Act was to render the Scottish Queen amenable to the law of England; for the statute of treasons was sufficiently comprehensive, especially as interpreted in that age, to reach any offence of a treasonable nature committed by a subject.[1]

Notwithstanding these ominous proceedings, Elizabeth still professed her willingness to come to terms with Mary, and even consented that her French secretary, Nau, should come to London with proposals for a final arrangement of the long-pending treaty. Mary, upon her part, with irretrievably broken health, was ready to renounce everything, her religion and her rank excepted, for the recovery of her liberty. She was prepared, in short, to accede to all Elizabeth's demands, and even to sign the Bond of Association; and, if she desired it, she was willing to continue to reside in England as a hostage for the due performance of her engagements.[2]

Of the perfect sincerity of Mary in making these

[1] Statutes, 27 Elizabeth.

[2] See articles proposed by Nau; Record Office. They are printed in Labanoff, vi. 58.

proposals no rational doubt can be entertained. Her confidential letters written at the time to the Archbishop of Glasgow[1] and the French ambassador, show that she was anxious above all things to win the friendship of Elizabeth. Even Walsingham was satisfied.[2] He was of opinion that his mistress should accept her offers; and Walsingham knew more of Mary Stewart than any of his colleagues, for he had for years past been in the habit of intercepting and perusing her correspondence. We may add that Walsingham had profited much less by the Reformation than his friends. He had no vast estates like Burghley and Leicester and Bedford, which might possibly be placed in

[1] On 5th January 1585, she writes to the Archbishop of Glasgow, speaking of the treaty: "Je suis mise en meilleure espérance que jamais, et cependant asseurée de tout bon et favorable traictment je vous charge de signiffier à tous messieurs mes parents, et aultres mes amys et serviteurs par delà que je les prie tous, tant en commun que chascun d'eulx en particulier, de se départir de toutes pratiques et négotiations, si aulcunes ils en ont tendant au trouble de cest état; le bien repos et préservation duquel je veux préférer à tout contentment et advantaige pour moy mesme, me résolvant a l'advenir de mè reposer principalment *sur l'amitié de la dicte Royne ma bonne soeur*," &c.—Labanoff, vi. 78. On 2d March 1585, she writes to Castelnau in the same strain: "Ma totale fiance est en la dicte Royne ma bonne soeur le bon natural de laquelle j'apercois et congnois de jour en jour par ses honorables procédures vers moy, *en ce que procède de son propre mouvement.*"—Labanoff, vi. 103. Again, on the 26th March, she writes to Castelnau, referring to the completion of the treaty by Elizabeth: "Si il luy plaist m'accepter pour sienne telle que je désire vivre le reste de mes jours, je la veulx obéyr et servir fidèlement et sincèrement."—Labanoff, vi. 142. These letters are utterly inconsistent with the letter said to have been written to Sir Francis Englefield above referred to.

[2] Walsingham was satisfied with the offers of Mary even before Nau's visit to London. On the 17th October Walsingham wrote to Sadler: "I am, as I have been always, persuaded, that there should be some trial made of her offers, with such caution as she promiseth to give, *wherewith I see no cause but that her majesty should rest satisfied.*"—Sadler State Papers, ii. 420. After Walsingham had so expressed himself, Mary made still more important concessions through Nau. In short, she conceded all that Elizabeth ever asked.

jeopardy by the accession of a Catholic sovereign to the throne. Walsingham, to his credit in this most corrupt age, lived and died a poor man; for although wholly unscrupulous as a minister, his private character was stainless.

From the silence of Burghley we may conclude that he and his friends were still opposed to the liberation of Mary; but it is highly probable that but for the treachery of the Master of Gray, their opposition would have been vain. That perfidious youth had arrived in London some weeks before Nau, in the double capacity of ambassador of James and confidential agent of his mother, through whose means she hoped that the long-projected association between her and her son would at length be concluded.[1] But Gray had formed a plan of his own, which involved at once the ruin of his friend Arran and the betrayal of his mistress. We have seen that the Council of England had secretly declared that instead of the proposed plan of the association between Mary and her son, it was desirable that a treaty should be concluded with her son alone;[2] and Gray, who no doubt had by this time ascertained their real wishes, resolved to be the instrument in carrying them out. He had coolly surveyed the state of parties both in Scotland and in England, and he concluded that he would best consult his own interest by promoting Burghley's scheme. To overthrow Arran without losing the favour of the king, and to sacrifice his mistress in the hope of gaining that of Elizabeth, such was the hazardous game he had to play. But Gray was equal to the task,

[1] Marie Stuart to Patrick Gray; Labanoff, vi. 70.

[2] *Ante*, p. 255.

and immediately on his arrival in London he set about it with an energy and an earnestness which took Elizabeth's ministers by surprise. They had received him, notwithstanding Hunsdon's letters, with considerable suspicion. His youth, his religion, his reputed devotion to the Scottish queen, were all calculated to inspire distrust. But he soon overcame their prejudices by the readiness with which he adopted and even anticipated their views; and, what is still more remarkable, he won the friendship of the virtuous and accomplished Philip Sidney.[1]

In spite of his address and his insinuating manners, Gray's treachery could not long be concealed. Mary's secretary soon discovered that, instead of proceeding with the plan of the association, he was negotiating the terms of a fresh treaty between Elizabeth and James, from which the Queen of Scots was to be excluded. Nau instantly acquainted his mistress with the alarming fact, which at first she could not credit. She could not believe in the treachery of Gray, who had ever professed the most profound devotion to her cause; still less could she believe in the desertion of her son. She wrote immediately to Gray,[2] expressing her surprise at the intelligence she had received. She reminded him that it was through her and her alone

[1] In a letter to Archibald Douglas from Sir Fulke Greville, afterwards Lord Brooke, is the following passage, written a few minutes after Sidney's death: "I am a stranger to the Master of Gray; but in honour of his memory that, while he lived, bare an honourable witness of his worth—I mean the prince of gentlemen, Sir Philip Sydney—I hope it shall be no trespass to present him love and honour by you. I pray you do it, and make me as much worth to him as you think good."—Lodge, ii. 296. See also a letter of Sir P. Sidney to Gray, in which he addresses him, "My most honoured brother."—Murdin, 557.

[2] Labanoff, vi. 72.

that her son derived his title to the crown of Scotland, and that it was more with a view to his interest than her own that she had consented to the projected treaty of association; that she could not believe in any change of sentiment on his part, for she had given him no cause of complaint; and notwithstanding the sinister tidings which had reached her, she trusted that without dissimulation or delay he would keep his plighted word like a true and obedient son. To James himself[1] she wrote much in the same strain; but while in this state of painful suspense she received another piece of unwelcome information. She was informed by her keepers, Sadler and Somers, that they had orders from the Council to remove her from Wingfield to Tutbury, where she had resided fifteen years before, and which was associated in her mind with many painful recollections. Mary was most unwilling to return to this dreary place, and she could not help associating the decision of the Council to send her thither with the suspicious conduct of Gray. But anxious at this time to conciliate Elizabeth at any sacrifice of personal feeling, she reluctantly consented to the change; and, accompanied by her keepers and her guards, she arrived on the 13th of January at her old quarters.[2]

It appears that they had been unoccupied since her

[1] Only a fragment of the letter remains.—See Labanoff, vi. 85.

[2] Two days were spent on the journey, as the roads were probably very bad. The party halted for the night at Derby, where Mary was lodged in the house of a widow lady, a Mrs Beaumont, who lived in the suburbs. Although Mary had abundant cause for anxiety at this time, she did not allow her private griefs to interfere with her habitual courtesy of manner. On the appearance of her hostess she kissed her, saying, playfully, "That she was come to trouble her, and that she also was a widow, and therefore trusted that they should agree well enough, having no husbands to trouble them."—Sadler, ii. 495.

last visit, and nothing could be more cheerless in the gloomy winter weather than the deserted aspect of the place. The rooms prepared for her use were miserably furnished, the walls discoloured with damp, and the doors and windows pervious to all the winds of heaven. Linen and bedding had to be borrowed from the houses of the neighbouring gentry, and the sleeping accommodation provided for her attendants was of the most wretched description. Mary had long been a martyr to rheumatism, and the exposed situation of Tutbury, standing on the summit of an abrupt eminence in the midst of a vast plain, soon told upon her health. Who suggested her removal to this the most wretched of all the prisons she occupied in England, does not appear; but we may assume that it was not Elizabeth, for when she heard of the real condition of the place she expressed the utmost indignation,[1] and gave peremptory orders that it should be properly furnished and repaired.

Meanwhile the Parliament, not satisfied with the severity of the existing laws against the Catholics, proceeded to enact measures of a still more rigorous kind. The pretended conspiracy of Arden, the confessions of Throgmorton, the capture of Chrichton, and the miraculously discovered evidence found upon him, were in the eyes of the zealots all conclusive proofs of the gigantic Popish plot, which had been hatched in Rome and in Madrid, for the overthrow of the true religion. They were clamorous, in spite of the persecutions of the last few years, for fresh penalties,

[1] She wrote to Sir R. Sadler expressing her anger at the persons "who have furnished Tutbury so basely, and thus given the Queen of Scots such just cause of complaint against her."—18th Feb. 1585; Record Office.

especially against the seminary priests; and in consequence of their agitation, a bill was introduced in the House of Commons which provided that, "If any clergyman born in the queen's dominions, and ordained by the authority of the Bishop of Rome, were found within the realm after the expiration of forty days, he should be adjudged guilty of high treason; that all persons aiding or receiving him should be guilty of felony; that whoever knew of his being in the kingdom, and did not discover him within twelve days, should be fined and imprisoned at the queen's pleasure; that all students in the Catholic seminaries who did not return within six months after proclamation to that effect, should be punished as traitors; that persons supplying them with money should incur a *premunire;* that parents sending their children abroad without licence should forfeit for every such offence one hundred pounds; and that children so sent should be rendered incapable of inheriting the property of their parents."[1]

On the third reading of this bill, Doctor William Parry, a Welshman, rose in his place and denounced it as a measure "full of blood, danger, and despair" to the queen's subjects.[2] Such freedom of speech was regarded as an insult both to the House and to the queen, and Parry was forthwith given into the custody of the sergeant-at-arms. But he seemed to possess some mysterious influence over the queen, for she ordered him to be set at liberty next day. He resumed his seat accordingly, but in the course of a few weeks he was again arrested, and sent to the Tower on a charge of treason.

This man had once been employed by Lord Burghley

[1] Statutes, 27 Eliz. [2] D'Ewes, 340, 341.

as a spy, and, like the class to which he belonged, had long been bankrupt both in character and fortune. Although oppressed with debt, having by some means obtained a seat in Parliament, he had become a candidate for an appointment in the city of London which was in the gift of the Crown. The rejection of his application, it is said, led him to form a plan for killing the queen. After his apprehension he made various confessions, in one of which he stated that a countryman of his, named Thomas Morgan, instigated him to murder Elizabeth. As Morgan had been for some time in the service of the Queen of Scots, and was at this time the administrator of her property in France, her enemies gave, or affected to give, implicit credit to the allegation. Parry was eventually arraigned on a charge of treason, and although he pleaded guilty, there was produced in evidence against him a letter which he had written to Elizabeth, a production remarkable in itself, and still more remarkable for certain passages which it contained, and which were afterwards, on its publication, suppressed.

These passages are not only interesting in themselves, but they prove that Elizabeth's ministers freely tampered with documents which they gave to the world as genuine. The first suppressed passage relates to Morgan, and is as follows: "Your majesty may see that there is never a man more of our nation abroad or at home, privy to this cause, but Thomas Morgan, a Catholic gentleman, so beloved, trusted, and protected in France as you shall hardly be able to touch him by any ordinary course; that proof *depending upon his yea and my nay;* and having no letter or cipher of his wherewith to charge him, leave him therefore to

God and his amendment." Why this passage was struck out is obvious enough. In the first place, Parry spoke in the highest terms of the estimation in which Morgan was held in France; and, secondly, he admitted that he had no evidence against him beyond his own unsupported allegation.

Another suppressed passage in Parry's letter related to the persecution of the Catholics.

"Give some ease," he said, "to your Catholic subjects. Remember the rest of my letter, and you shall find that God will bless you, foreign princes esteem you, and your subjects obey you."

Another passage related to Spain, as follows: "The indignities past between your majesty and the king Catholic are many, and you have disquieted his state, maintained his rebels, and do bear with such as have robbed him and his subjects; many merchants are undone, some few are enriched, some bad humours pleased, and yourself dishonoured. It may cost you dear; look to it in time; there is possibility to repair all."

The letter published contained the following allusion to the Queen of Scots: "The Queen of Scots is your prisoner, let her be honourably entreated, but yet surely guarded."[1] The remainder of the passage relating to her was suppressed, namely: "She may do you good, she will do you no harm, if the fault be not English. Satisfy her reasonably in her keepers; it may else prove dangerous. It was well once, it cannot be bettered now; a new governor and a new guard may breed new doubts, impulsion may do harm. Please

[1] In the State Trials, i. 1104, and also in Holinshed, the passages here given are omitted. They are taken from Strype, who says he copied them himself from the original.—Strype, Annals, iii. Appen. 103.

yourself in this cause, it importeth you much; so long as it is well with her it is safe with you; when she is in fear you are not without peril; cherish and love her. She is of your blood, and your undoubted heir in succession. It is so taken abroad, and will be found so at home. The prince, her son, hath been ill handled by his subjects, troubled with inlet heretic practices, and often endangered in person; now you have him, protect him; he is your kinsman, and second saulty.[1] Last of all, forget the title of supreme governor; trouble none that refuse to swear it, for that cannot agree with your sex. Luther and Calvin did not allow it. The Puritans smile at it, and the Catholic world doth utterly condemn it.

"Remember your unfortunate Parry, chiefly overthrown by your own hand. Amend it in the rest of your servants, for it is past with me, if your grace be not greater than I look for. And lastly, and ever good madam be good to your obedient Catholic subjects; for the bad I speak not. From the Tower, 14th February."

Such were the passages in Parry's letter to the queen, which her ministers thought fit to suppress. There is, in fact, a mystery about this man's case which has never been explained. He seems to have pleaded guilty in the belief that his life would be spared. Whether any means were taken to induce him to acknowledge his guilt we do not know, but upon sentence of death being pronounced upon him, he exclaimed, "I here summon Queen Elizabeth to answer for my blood before God." He was executed in the horrible manner prescribed for the punishment of traitors.[2]

[1] *i. e.*, self.

[2] Sir Thomas Lucy (Shakespeare's Justice Shallow), had proposed in the

The accusation of Morgan by Parry, though unsupported by any kind of proof,[1] was, like the capture of Chrichton, immediately laid hold of by the enemies of Mary; and Elizabeth not only complained to her[2] on the subject, but she insisted in the most peremptory terms that the King of France should deliver up Morgan to her ambassador.[3] She was well aware that Henry, justly alarmed at the growing power of Guise and the Holy League, durst not quarrel with her at this time; and although he declined to comply with her demand, he sent Morgan to the Bastile.[4]

plenitude of his wisdom as "a Parliament member and justice of peace," that the House should proceed to devise some new law for the execution of Parry, "as may be thought fittest for his so extraordinary and most horrible kind of treason."—D'Ewes' Journal, 355. But Sir Thomas has left on the statute-book no specimen of his legislative skill in devising new kinds of torture. The existing law of treason was deemed severe enough even for Parry. On being turned off by the hangman he was immediately cut down and disembowelled alive. See the account of his execution in Strype, Annals, iii. 364. It is a curious fact that when Parry was acting as a spy of Burghley a year or two before, he informed him that the punishments inflicted on the English Catholics had created a strong sensation abroad; and as if in anticipation of his own fate, he recommended that the more revolting penalties attaching to treason should be discontinued. Writing from Venice in March 1582, he says: "The new book printed at Rome, dedicated to the Cardinal S. Sixti, and intituled *De persecutione Anglicana*, hath raised a barbarous opinion of our cruelty. I could wish that in those cases it might please her majesty *to pardon the dismembering and quartering*."—Parry to Burghley; Wright, ii. 192.

[1] We have seen that, beyond the bare allegations of Parry, there was no evidence against Morgan. Mary declared that she thought him incapable of such a crime—Jebb, ii. 675; and she expressed the utmost horror at the design of Parry. Writing to Castelnau on the subject she says: "Quant à l'accident dernièrement survenu de ce malheureux homme Pari, je loue grandement Dieu de la grâce qu'il a faicte en cela à la dite Royne ma bonne sœur, d'avoir hereusement decouvert un si horrible et détestable desseing," &c.—Labanoff, vi. 109.

[2] Elizabeth to Mary; Record Office.

[3] Elizabeth to Henry III. and Catherine de Medici, 10th March; Record Office.

[4] Walsingham to Sir Edward Stafford, March 7th; ibid.

Mary was meanwhile spending a miserable winter in her gloomy prison at Tutbury. The place was not only cold and damp, but the drainage was found to be in so foul a state as to be highly dangerous to the health of the inmates. Sadler and Somers seem to have done everything in their power to alleviate the sufferings of their prisoner. Sir Ralph even invited her occasionally to ride out with him on hawking expeditions near the castle. But he was sharply reprimanded for his pains, and received strict injunctions that such indulgences were not to be repeated. The old knight, who had been acquainted with Mary from her infancy, pleaded in extenuation that she had never been at any time more than three miles distant from the castle, and that there was a body of attendants, well armed, always present. He significantly added, "Her majesty may be assured that if any danger had been offered, *or doubt suspected*, this queen's body should first have tasted of the gall."[1] We have here a curious picture. It appears that while Mary, with her keeper by her side, was watching the herons and the hawks from the banks of the peaceful Dove, a picked body of attendants were watching her, with strict injunctions to despatch her on the instant, should she either attempt to escape, or should any attempt be made for her deliverance.

Mary's dislike to her new abode was aggravated by a painful incident which happened shortly after her arrival. A young Catholic, who was confined as a prisoner in the castle on account of his religion, was compelled to join in the services along with Sir Ralph Sadler's servants. Day by day, Mary saw from the windows

[1] Sadler, ii. 538.

of her apartment the unfortunate man dragged forcibly across the courtyard of the castle to take part in ceremonies forbidden by his creed. Powerless to protect, she could only pity this unhappy victim of Protestant bigotry, who, rather than continue to do violence to his conscience, resolved to put an end to his existence.[1] He contrived in some way to strangle himself, and was found dead one morning in his cell.

The incident seems to have made a deep impression upon Mary. Perhaps, while compassionating the man whose sufferings and brutal treatment she had witnessed, she read in his tragical fate the prelude to her own. Everything indeed at this time seemed to indicate that a crisis was approaching. The obstinate silence of Elizabeth, the suspicious conduct of James, the now no longer doubtful treachery of Gray, and the additional rigours of her imprisonment, for which no reason was assigned, all told the same tale. But gloomy although her prospects were, it was not in Mary's nature to abandon herself to listless melancholy; and the case of the unhappy suicide at Tutbury induced her to address her sister queen, and to give her at the same time some wholesome advice on the subject of religious persecution.

As the most tolerant of European sovereigns, this was a subject upon which Mary had a right to speak. She pointed out to Elizabeth the dangerous amount of disaffection to which her persecution of the Catholics had given rise; and she reminded her further, that the earlier years of her reign, which were passed in tranquillity, were years of religious toleration.[2] Elizabeth knew all this as well as Mary, and she probably looked

[1] Mary to Elizabeth; Labanoff, vi. 152.

[2] Labanoff, vi. 157.

back to those peaceful days with genuine regret. But her ministers had embarked her in a crusade against her Catholic subjects from which she could not now recede; and if the best test of statesmanship is success, it must be admitted that they were successful; for Protestantism was in the end as truly established in England by the terrors of the law, as it was suppressed in France by the power of the sword.

Still without tidings of her son, she yet hoped and trusted that he at least, in spite of Gray's treachery, would not abandon her. A letter from James himself at length put an end to her suspense. It contained a brief, cold, deadly message, framed without doubt by the arch-traitor Gray. The young king informed her that as she was a prisoner in a foreign country, he did not consider that she was in a position to enter into any association, "but that he should ever be prepared to recognise her as queen-mother."[1]

This was the bitterest hour of Mary's life. Through the long and dreary years of her captivity, even when her prospects were at the darkest, she was cheered by one ray of hope, and of that she trusted her enemies would never be able to deprive her. From the period of his boyhood her son and she had been on terms as affectionate as, under the very peculiar circumstances, could have been looked for. Now that he was a man, she fondly believed that he would prove the means of her deliverance. In this belief she had assented to the scheme of the association proposed by the French king. For this she had consented to the surrender of her crown, and of all her rights

[1] Je vous ai toujours reconnue et reconnoitrai, ma vie durant, pour reine mère.—Addit. aux Mèmoires de Castelnau, t. i. 637.

except the barren title of a queen; and now, in return for all the sacrifices she had made, and was willing still to make, for him, he coldly told her that he declined her offers, for she had nothing now to give. No one but Darnley's son could have sent her such a message; nor need we be surprised that in the first outburst of outraged affection she should have threatened him with a mother's curse.[1] She even appealed in her distress to the womanly sympathies of her rival. But menaces and prayers were alike unavailing to avert the greatest of all the calamities that had yet befallen her.

[1] Mary to Castelnau, 12th March; Labanoff, vi. 126.

CHAPTER XXIII.

LEAGUE BETWEEN ELIZABETH AND JAMES—INTERVENTION IN THE NETHERLANDS.

Gray had meanwhile returned to Scotland with a sum of money for the king, as an earnest of the pension which, when the treaty was concluded, Elizabeth had promised him. The young diplomatist had succeeded even beyond his expectations. By his desertion of his mistress he had won the confidence of Elizabeth, and through his influence over James he had brought about a fatal breach between him and his mother. But the most dangerous part of Gray's task yet remained. Arran was still the king's first favourite, and like to prove a formidable adversary to any one who ventured to assail him. Arran, moreover, having received no definite reply to his overtures to Elizabeth, had since offered his services to the Queen of Scots.[1] Here was a serious obstacle in Gray's path, and how to remove it was the question he had now to solve. The most obvious plan of dealing with Arran was, in the language of the day, to "let slip" the banished lords against him; for Angus, Mar, Glammis, and the Hamiltons were all his mortal enemies. But James

[1] See Mary's letter to her son of 5th January 1585; Labanoff, vi. 85.

was obstinately opposed to their restoration, as well on account of Arran as upon that of their religion. Angus and Mar were both strict Presbyterians; and if they were pardoned, the like favour could hardly be denied to Andrew Melvill and the other ministers who had accompanied them in their flight to England; and Elizabeth herself did not more cordially detest the Presbyterian form of worship than did her godson of Scotland.

Arran was too keen-sighted not to suspect that Gray intended mischief, and his suspicions were strengthened by the arrival of an ambassador from England, with whom the new favourite seemed to be upon most intimate terms. Sir Edward Wotton, Elizabeth's new envoy, had been sent to Scotland to conclude the projected league with James. He was authorised to promise him a pension, and in the mean time he brought him a present of valuable horses from the royal stables,[1] and a pack of buckhounds of a superior breed. James was delighted with the horses and the dogs, as well as with the new ambassador, who was young, witty, and agreeable, and, what James valued still more, devoted to field-sports[2] of every kind. While the young king

[1] Calderwood, iv. 372, says that Wotton brought with him, besides horses, "with their furniture, three score or four score couple of hounds, with which the king passed his time all that summer;" Wodrow edition.

[2] A ludicrous instance of James's devotion to the chase is related at this time. One day, after an unusually hard run, he called for a cup of wine, and drank to all his hounds; and, taking the paw of a favourite named Tell True, he thus addressed him: "Tell True, I drink to thee above all my hounds; and sooner trust thy tongue than either Craig or the Bishop." Craig was the royal chaplain, and the Bishop was Montgomery of Glasgow. The incident was reported, probably with much exaggeration, to the banished ministers, who expressed great surprise and sorrow at the king's profanity.—Tytler, viii. 224, and Calderwood.

was thus employed, Wotton and Gray were busily planning the ruin of the favourite. Gray soon made up his mind upon the matter. He thought the simplest and the safest plan was murder. The English envoy was at first somewhat staggered by this proposal, but his scruples were overcome by the arguments of Gray. A man had been found who was ready to undertake the business, and who was recommended for the purpose by no less a personage than the chief criminal judge in Scotland, the Lord Justice-Clerk Bellenden. The volunteer assassin was a gentleman by birth named Douglas, and he had a secret interview with Wotton on the subject, which the latter described in a ciphered despatch to Walsingham and Leicester. Although during the interview the English envoy took care not to commit himself or his superiors, it is clear that he led Douglas to understand that neither he nor they regarded with disapproval the projected murder. "In general speeches," said Wotton, "I told him that your honours were personages that had him in special recommendation. I told him I would make relation of the matter to your honours; and he said he would write himself to Mr Secretary; and so praying me, if I did write aught, to commit his name to cipher, he departed."[1]

But before any definite steps were taken in the matter, an incident occurred on the Border, which for a time threw all into confusion. At a meeting between the Wardens of the Middle Marches, Sir John Foster and Ker of Fernihirst, a quarrel arose from some trifling cause between their respective followers. Some lives were lost, and Lord Russell, the eldest son

[1] Calig., c. viii. fol. 195; letter of 1st June 1585.

of the Earl of Bedford, who happened to be present as the guest of Foster, was killed. There is every reason to believe that his death was unpremeditated; and such was the opinion of Foster himself.[1] But Walsingham instantly saw in this unhappy incident a means of overthrowing Arran without resorting to the dangerous scheme of Gray. Fernihirst, like most of the Border chiefs, had been throughout his life a stanch adherent of the Scottish queen. But he was also the friend of Arran, and an excellent opportunity had now occurred for effecting the ruin of both these powerful men. Foster was accordingly instructed to give another version[2] of the affair, and to assert that the death of Lord Russell was preconcerted. Elizabeth then demanded that both Arran and Fernihirst should be sent to Carlisle, and there tried for the murder.[3] James, who had exhibited extreme grief on hearing of Lord Russell's death, refused to send the suspected noblemen to England, but he caused them both to be arrested, and ordered an immediate inquiry into the charges made against them, and which were apparently unfounded. No motive, indeed, can be suggested why either Arran or Fernihirst should have sought the life of Lord Russell. Gray, meanwhile, seems to have meditated some fresh piece of treachery, for he most unexpectedly appeared as the friend of Arran, who through his means was allowed to leave the Castle of St Andrews, where he had been imprisoned, and to retire to his own house at Kinneil.[4] This conduct of Gray, who had no doubt been bribed

[1] Foster to Walsingham; B. C., Record Office, July 28.
[2] Wotton to Walsingham, July 31; Record Office.
[3] Wotton to Walsingham, July 29 and 30; ibid.
[4] Tytler, viii. 228.

for the occasion, rendered him an object of extreme suspicion, and he seems to have hesitated at this time whether or not he should desert his English patrons and form a close alliance with the still all-powerful favourite, of whom he had all along professed himself to be the friend. But he finally resolved, apparently after consulting his countryman Archibald Douglas,[1] to proceed with his original design. As the scheme of the murder had been abandoned, there was, in his opinion, only one other mode of overthrowing Arran, and that was by restoring the banished lords and forcing the king to part with his favourite. So long as he retained his power it was hopeless to expect the conclusion of the much-desired league, which was intended to create a lasting breach between the young king and his mother. Arran had now espoused her cause, and had opened up a correspondence with the Duke of Guise and her other friends in France; and as James would neither consent to part with his favourite nor to restore the rebel lords, it was necessary to resort to force to compel him to do both.

Walsingham, who had all along been in favour of this scheme, and who was in constant communication with Archibald Douglas, now desired Wotton to co-operate with Gray in effecting their common purpose, and gave notice to Angus and his friends to move northwards with as much secrecy as possible.[2] Lord Maxwell, the most powerful nobleman on the Border, had been gained over by Gray by the promise of a handsome share of Arran's vast estates.[3] Arran mean-

[1] See Gray's letter to Douglas, Cotton MSS.; Calig., c. viii. 222.

[2] Tytler, viii. 238.

[3] Lord Maxwell had now been created Earl of Morton; but, to prevent confusion, his original title is preserved throughout.

while was not idle. He saw that the inevitable struggle between him and his enemies was fast approaching, and he resolved with characteristic promptitude to strike the first blow. Although he was, nominally at least, a prisoner in his own house, his friend Colonel Stewart accused Wotton to his face, and in presence of the king, of his intended treachery. Wotton gave him the lie; but hearing that the king intended to arrest him, he made a precipitate flight to Berwick, as his predecessor Randolph had done for similar reasons on more than one occasion.[1]

At Berwick, Wotton found Angus and the other outlawed nobles, accompanied by the banished ministers, preparing to enter Scotland.[2] As soon as this alarming intelligence reached Arran he hurried to Stirling, where the king then was, and implored him to arrest the Master of Gray, who, he declared, was the author of the whole conspiracy. Gray was at the time in the neighbouring county of Fife, and on receiving a summons from the king, was placed in a most dangerous dilemma. To disobey the order was treason; to obey it was to place himself in Arran's power. But trusting to his influence over the king, and to the speedy advance of his confederates from the south, he resolved to run the risk of returning to Court, and rode to Stirling accompanied by his friends. Notwithstanding all that had passed, he was so favourably received, that it is said to have been Arran's intention to have stabbed him in the king's presence.[3] But this design, if he ever entertained it, was frustrated by the rapid

[1] Calderwood, iv. 380.

[2] Calderwood, iv. 381. Wotton to Elizabeth, 15th Oct.; Record Office.

[3] Papers relating to the Master of Gray, published by the Bannatyne Club, p. 59.

movements of Angus and his friends, who, being joined by Lord Maxwell at Falkirk, advanced upon Stirling with a body of eight thousand men. Wholly unprepared to resist such a force, Arran fled on their approach, and the king found himself once more in the hands of the faction which three years before had made him a prisoner at Ruthven Castle. James had now a difficult part to play, and he seems to have played it to perfection. Although in reality a prisoner in the hands of Angus and his friends, he affected to treat them as penitent subjects who sought to be restored to the royal favour; and as they only desired to regain their forfeited estates and titles, they were content through Gray's intervention to make their submission to the king, who upon his part was willing to forget the past, and even to declare that the enterprise they had brought to so triumphant an issue, had been undertaken in his service.[1]

Gray hastened to apprise Elizabeth of the complete success of the plot, and advised her to send an ambassador to Scotland without loss of time to conclude the projected treaty.[2] But before his advice could be followed, the Court of France made a final effort to induce James to revive the old alliance between the two kingdoms. The complete success of Angus and the English faction at length roused the jealousy of Henry. Castelnau, who had now returned to France, and whose efforts on behalf of Mary had been so fatally thwarted by the miserable policy of Catherine, supported the king to the utmost of his power. But Henry moved too late. Had he sought in earnest to

[1] Papers relating to the Master of Gray, p. 60.

[2] Master of Gray to Walsingham, Nov. 6; Record Office.

carry out the plan of the association between Mary and her son, which he had been the first to propose, Elizabeth would have found it impossible to withhold her consent. But all hope of this arrangement was now gone; and in Henry's instructions[1] to the Baron d'Esneval, whom he now sent as ambassador to Scotland, Mary's name was not even mentioned. We may probably ascribe to the influence of Catherine this significant omission.

D'Esneval found the king at Falkland, devoted as usual to his horses and hounds. The leaders of the late revolution were not at Court, but the French ambassador shrewdly suspected that the king was surrounded by their creatures although they themselves resided on their own estates.[2] James received his uncle's envoy with every demonstration of respect; but he soon discovered that Henry had no presents to give and no offers to make. He could only remind his nephew, with many professions of attachment, that the alliance between France and Scotland was of very ancient standing, and that old and tried friends were to be preferred to new ones.[3]

Elizabeth had promised him, on the other hand, a handsome pension in lieu of the Lennox estates, and had led him to believe that she intended him to be her successor. Shortly after receiving Gray's message she had sent her relative, William Knowles, on a special mission to James, and he reported so favourably of the state of affairs,[4] and of the friendly disposi-

[1] See his instructions, 15th December 1585; Cheruel, p. 358.
[2] Memoire par M. d'Esneval au roy; Cheruel, p. 376.
[3] Henri III. à M. d'Esneval; Cheruel, p. 364.
[4] Knowles to Walsingham; Record Office, Nov. 24th.

tion of the king, that she commissioned the veteran Randolph to proceed once more to Scotland to conclude the league between the two countries. There was now no serious difficulty in coming to terms. A Parliament had been summoned before Randolph's arrival, which authorised the king to make a treaty with the Queen of England.[1] The Catholic party, although strongly opposed to the measure, were comparatively powerless; and James finally agreed to an offensive and defensive league with Elizabeth, to which his mother was no party, and in which her name was not even mentioned.[2] Burghley's long-cherished scheme was accomplished at last.

Next to the Master of Gray, Archibald Douglas[3]

[1] Record Office, copy of Act, 10th December 1585. It would appear from this Act that the royal prerogative was more restricted in Scotland than in England, where the sovereign has always exercised the right of making treaties independent of the Legislature.

[2] The terms of the treaty were concluded in May, and it was finally signed at Berwick, on 5th July 1586, by commissioners appointed for the purpose. It was stipulated that if England were invaded by a foreign enemy, in any part remote from Scotland, the King of Scots promised to send two thousand horse or five thousand foot to her assistance; if Scotland were invaded, the queen was to furnish three thousand horse or six thousand foot to aid in its defence; and if the invasion of England took place within sixty miles of the English border, James was to join the English army with the whole of his forces. All rebels harboured within either country were to be delivered up, or compelled to depart the realm. No contract was to be made by either prince with any foreign State, to the prejudice of this league; and all former treaties of amity between the predecessors of the two princes were to remain in force. As to the remaining provisions of the treaty, see Record Office, July 5, 1586.

[3] "The Master of Gray and Archibald Douglas, which two men remain constant to the queen's majesty's friendship."—Burghley to Leicester, 20th June 1586; Wright, ii. 301. "Mr Archibald Douglas getteth the king's remission for all offences committed under his seal, included in the common terms of *super inquirendis*, and that by means of the Master of Gray and the Justice-Clerk. Yea, howbeit he was guilty of the murder of the king's father, and solicited others to that

was the man by whose advice Burghley and his mistress were mainly guided in the conduct of their policy in Scotland. Being a kinsman of Angus, Douglas had done good service in bringing about the late revolution, and Elizabeth now wrote strongly to James on his behalf. That she should ask him to receive into favour one of his father's murderers was a remarkable request for her to make; that he should readily comply with it was still more remarkable. After a mock trial, in which he was acquitted, through the connivance of the Lord Justice-Clerk Bellenden, his lands and honours were restored to him. The proceeding, even in that day, was regarded with mingled surprise and indignation.

A close alliance with Scotland was at this time of the utmost consequence to Elizabeth; for after twenty years of secret hostility, and innumerable acts of piracy and plunder committed against his subjects, at her instigation or by her connivance, she found herself at last, to her great discomfort and annoyance, at open war with the King of Spain. We have already mentioned that on the death of Don John of Austria, his nephew, Alexander Farnese,[1] Prince of Parma, succeeded to the government of the revolted States; and it seems probable that but for the transcendent abilities of that remarkable man, they would long before this time have achieved their independence.

villanous fact, he was intrusted with the king's affairs, and appointed to be his agent in England; whereat many did wonder."—Calderwood MSS. Yet in the account of Darnley's death contained in this history, no mention is made of Archibald Douglas. The whole blame, as in other Protestant narratives, is thrown upon the queen and Bothwell.

[1] He was the son of the Duke of Parma, and his mother, the regent of the Netherlands, was a daughter of Charles V.

Parma was not long in discovering, as his uncle had discovered before him, that no reliance could be placed on Philip. In the matter of advice, the king was liberal to profusion; but that was a commodity with which the viceroy could well dispense. What he always wanted, and what he never could obtain at the right time, were troops and money. His soldiers often half starved, and always far too few for the work they had in hand, were composed of adventurers of all nations; while his enemies were on their native soil, and fighting as well for their country as their religion. But equally skilled in statecraft and in war, Parma had by a master-stroke of policy succeeded in the year 1579 in detaching the Belgian provinces from the revolted States,[1] and thus diminished by one-half the number of his enemies. Since then, in spite of all the efforts of the patriot armies, and the unbending resolution of the Prince of Orange, he had been steadily gaining ground. It was a contest in which innumerable barbarities were committed on either side; for the spirit of chivalry never sank so low as during the terrible wars of the Reformation. We have seen that the Prince of Orange had formed a design of kidnapping Don John of Austria,[2] and it is painful to find a man of Parma's heroic nature subsequently approving of the murder of the Prince of Orange.[3] After that event the sovereignty of the Netherlands was offered first to the King of France, and afterwards to Elizabeth. Both refused the dangerous gift; but circumstances now compelled the English queen to abandon her underhand dealing, and to espouse the

[1] Motley's Dutch Republic, iii. 426.
[2] *Ante*, p. 193. [3] Motley, iii. 603-613.

cause of the States openly. Parma had laid siege to Antwerp, the most opulent city in the Netherlands, if not in Europe, and the possession of that important place was believed to be an essential step to Philip's long-meditated scheme for the invasion of England. The representatives of the States entreated Elizabeth, as well for their sake as her own, to take immediate measures for the relief of their commercial capital.[1] Their efforts were warmly seconded by Walsingham, who, now that war with Spain was inevitable, was for proceeding to work in earnest. Parma's army was notoriously too weak[2] for the enterprise in which he had embarked. A few thousand troops would have turned the scale hopelessly against him, and both in England and in Scotland[3] any number of volunteers might have been readily obtained. But it was not in Elizabeth's nature to act consistently, or honestly, or wisely. After innumerable promises and protestations, and resolutions made and broken and resumed again, she finally did nothing, and Antwerp was abandoned to its fate.

While Elizabeth was lost in helpless hesitation, Parma was proceeding vigorously with the siege. With the insignificant force at his command he could not attempt to invest the town; but he managed to cut off all communication between it and the sea, whence it derived nearly the whole of its supplies. With incal-

[1] Proposals of States Commissioners, June; Record Office.

[2] It consisted of only 8000 men.

[3] The Master of Gray offered himself to raise three or four thousand men for service in the Netherlands. See papers relating to the Master of Gray, p. 70. But Elizabeth was of opinion that he was better employed in Scotland, where he had proved himself so useful, than in the Netherlands.

culable labour, and harassed by incessant interruptions by the enemy, he contrived in the middle of winter to throw a fortified bridge of boats across the Scheldt, at a point where it was upwards of half a mile in width.[1] After the work had been completed, it was burst asunder by a cunningly constructed fire-ship, which came drifting down the river from the beleaguered town, and blew to atoms a thousand of his best troops, at a time when he was sorely in need of reinforcements.[2] But nothing could daunt that indomitable man. Before his enemies could follow up their advantage he had once more knit up and repaired the shattered bridge, which effectually intercepted all traffic on the river, and which, as a military achievement, stands unrivalled in that, or perhaps in any other age. Finding Parma's work impregnable, the besieged made a series of desperate attacks upon his intrenchments, and with his rapidly diminishing forces, his position at times became extremely critical. But he contrived to hold his ground until the approach of famine compelled his opponents to surrender. Antwerp capitulated on the 17th of August, and the triumph of Parma was sullied by none of those scenes of cold-blooded butchery which too often followed a Spanish victory in the Netherlands. To conciliate the people he had conquered, he even agreed that none of his Spanish or Italian troops should accompany him when he entered the town; but that he should be followed only by his Walloons and Germans.[3]

To oppose this consummate master of the art of war, now in the prime of manhood,[4] Elizabeth determined

[1] Motley's United Netherlands, i. 181. [2] Ibid., 196, 197.
[3] Ibid., i. 258. [4] Parma was at this time thirty-seven years old.

to send her now somewhat antiquated admirer, Leicester, who, although the most accomplished of courtiers and the most unscrupulous of intriguers, had

"Never set a squadron in the field,"

and whose sole qualification for the post seems to have been unbounded confidence in himself. But Leicester was to be accompanied by various soldiers of repute who had served as volunteers under the Prince of Orange, and by a number of young men of rank, all eager for distinction on the great military theatre of Europe.[1] The number of troops to be supplied by the queen was five thousand, the cost of which was to be defrayed by the States. But Elizabeth, knowing the value of her own promises, put no faith in those of others. She insisted on a material guarantee for the repayment of her money; and after months of diplomatic haggling, during which Antwerp might easily have been saved, it was finally agreed that four seaport towns—namely, Brill, Flushing, Sluys, and Ostend—should be placed in her hands.[2] While Elizabeth was negotiating with the deputies of the States, Drake was preparing for a fresh trip to the Spanish main; and, emboldened by his past successes, he commenced operations by a descent on the coast of Gallicia, where, to the great consternation of the inhabitants, he laid the town of Vigo under contribution. Steering thence across the Atlantic, he plundered St Domingo and Carthagena. But the climate told with such fatal effect upon his sailors, that he was compelled to make his way back to England with much less booty

[1] Camden, p. 292. [2] Motley's United Netherlands, i. chap. vi.

than he had formerly acquired, but with greatly increased renown.[1]

On his arrival in Holland, on the 10th of December, Leicester was received with immense enthusiasm;[2] and the four towns were, in terms of the treaty, occupied by English troops. The queen had expressly commanded him not to accept any commission or post of honour from the States; yet so absolute was his reliance on the royal favour, that, in defiance of her prohibition, he assumed the title of Governor-General, before she was even aware that it had been offered to him. When she heard, therefore, of Leicester's audacity, her rage and fury were boundless. Davison, whom the earl sent from Holland to explain the reasons which had induced him to disobey her, was driven from her presence by a torrent of abuse;[3] and Thomas Heneage was ordered to proceed immediately to the Hague, to inform both Leicester and the States, that the appointment he had received must be forthwith cancelled. Yet she afterwards relented, and allowed him to retain the barren dignity during his brief and inglorious career in the Netherlands.

The rage of Elizabeth at the presumption of her favourite was immensely aggravated by a circumstance of which at the time he was profoundly ignorant. With that systematic inconsistency which forms so striking a feature in her character, she had no sooner consented to aid the States openly, than she secretly determined to betray them; and that Burghley lent his countenance to this perfidious scheme is not to be

[1] News of Sir F. Drake, October; Record Office.

[2] Motley's United Netherlands, i. chap. vii.

[3] Davison to Leicester, February 17; Record Office.

disputed. The possession of the four Dutch seaports by his mistress gave her an advantage in negotiating with Philip which she never before possessed. By giving them back, not to the States, from whom she had received them, but to the sovereign whose allegiance they had renounced, she might not only make an advantageous peace with that formidable monarch, but divert him from his long-cherished schemes of vengeance against herself. The agents employed to conduct this iniquitous negotiation were two Italian merchants named Grafigni and De Loo, and an Englishman named Bodenham, who had been in the service of the Prince of Parma. At first there was some difficulty on the score of religion. Burghley was quite willing to restore the revolted States to Philip, and even to *compel* them to return to their allegiance, provided he would tolerate the new religion.[1] But eventually even this point was abandoned, and the Spanish emissaries were informed through Lord Buckhurst, who, with Sir Christopher Hatton, and Sir James Crofts, the Comptroller of the Household, was in the secret of the peace negotiations, that, in the matter of religion, Elizabeth would be satisfied if Philip would grant to his subjects as much toleration *as his honour and conscience would allow him*.[2] Elizabeth further stipu-

[1] In a letter to one of the Spanish emissaries, De Loo, dated the 6th March 1586, Burghley expresses himself as follows: "You answered Champagny correctly as to what I said last winter concerning her majesty's wishes in regard to a pacification. *The Netherlands must be compelled to return to obedience to the king*, but their ancient privileges are to be maintained. You omitted, however, to say a word about toleration in the provinces of the Reformed religion. But I said then as I say now, that this is a condition indispensable to peace."—Quoted by Motley, United Netherlands, i. 495, from Simancas.

[2] See Motley, i. 449, and authorities from Simancas there cited.

lated for the repayment of the expenses of Leicester's expedition and of the occupation of the cautionary towns, amounting, it seems, to £76,000. It is difficult to say which of these two conditions was the more extraordinary—the proposed abandonment of her Protestant allies to the "honour and conscience" of Philip, or her demand for the repayment of money which she had lent to his subjects to aid them in their rebellion.

Walsingham, who all along desired that the war in Holland should be prosecuted in earnest, was no party to this intrigue, and through his vigilance it was eventually defeated.[1] By exposing the treachery of Sir James Crofts in presence of the Council,[2] he forced the queen to deny all knowledge of the affair, and to disown the agents with whom she had taken care not to commit herself personally by word or writing. A mystery which had for sometime perplexed Walsingham was now explained. During these secret negotiations, which lasted several months, the English soldiers in Holland were allowed to starve.[3] Leicester, to do him justice, made every effort to relieve them;[4]

[1] On discovering the scheme he at once acquainted Leicester, in language strongly expressive of his disgust. "To the end," he says, "your lordship may see what instruments are used in our mediation of peace, I send you the copies of certain letters by good hap come to my hands. I have let her majesty understand how *dangerous and dishonourable* it is for her to have such base and ill-affected ministers used therein. If either your lordship or myself should use such instruments I know we should bear no small reproach; but it is the good hap of hollow and doubtful men to be best thought of."—Leicester Correspondence, Walsingham to Leicester, 21st April 1586.

[2] Motley, i. 514 *et seq.*

[3] "Had Burghley and Crofts been in the pay of Philip they could hardly have served him better than they had been doing by the course pursued."—Motley, p. 520.

[4] Leicester to Burghley, Aug. 10; Leicester Correspondence, 260, 294, 299, 303.

he even pledged his own credit and mortgaged his estates to obtain for them the supplies of which they stood so urgently in need. The care he manifested for his troops was the one redeeming feature of his administration in the Netherlands. But Elizabeth, dreaming only of peace and exchanging compliments with Parma, who could flatter a vain woman as skilfully as he could win a battle or take a city, remained deaf to the calls of humanity, and allowed her soldiers to die literally by thousands for want of food and shelter. To all the representations which were made to her upon the subject she only replied by loudly complaining of the large sums they had already cost her.[1] Leicester meanwhile, although he did his best for his suffering countrymen, was giving abundant proofs of his unfitness for the high post which had been thrust upon him. In his vain attempts to stop the victorious career of Parma, who after the capture of Antwerp made himself master of the principal towns on the Meuse and on the Rhine, he quarrelled with his best officers, he offended the States by his continued displays of arrogance and ostentation, and sought by the severity of his military punishments to throw on his subordinates the responsibility of his military failures.[2] Individually his volunteers were ever conspicuous for their gallantry; but the reputation they acquired was dearly purchased by the loss of Sir Philip Sidney,

[1] "Until the state of the queen's army by muster-books and her monthly charges may appear more clear, here will be no further means for any more money. At this present there is paid £24,000, and that added to her majesty's former charge of £52,000, maketh £76,000, which sum her majesty doth often repeat *with great offence*."—Burghley to Leicester, 31st March; Correspondence.

[2] See the account of the execution of Baron Hemart for the surrender of Grave—Motley, United Netherlands, ii. 24.

who had been appointed governor of Flushing. That eminent person fell in a famous cavalry fight at Zutphen,[1] to the universal grief of his countrymen, who justly regarded him as the model of all knightly accomplishments and virtues. Shortly after that event Leicester returned to England, where his presence was required to aid in the deliberations of the Council respecting the final disposal of the Queen of Scots.

No sooner had that unhappy princess been abandoned by her son than her enemies proceeded to increase the rigours of her imprisonment. Sir Ralph Sadler, who had been rebuked for the indulgence he had shown her, was relieved of his charge, and Sir Amias Paulet was appointed in his place. Paulet was a creature of the Earl of Leicester, a Puritan in his religion, and a bear in his manners and conversation. One of his first measures on his arrival at Tutbury was to prohibit his prisoner from giving alms to the poor, a piece of tyranny which at first sight appears inexplicable. But the object of her enemies at this time seems to have been either to shorten her days by confining her in a damp unwholesome prison, or to force her through sheer desperation[2] to engage in some enterprise or conspiracy which would bring her within the operation of the recent statute. In prohibiting her from distributing her usual charities, Paulet

[1] Motley, ii. 57 ; Froude, xii. 195.

[2] Mary, after informing Castelnau that, among other innovations, Paulet had prohibited her from giving alms to the poor, continues as follows : "Vous en ferez s'il vous plest, remonstrance de ma part à la dicte Royne, ma bonne sœur, pour la pryer de faire commander au sieur Paulet de ne m'user de ceste facon, n'y ayant si pauvre vil et abject criminel et prisonnier à qui ceste permission soit jamais, par aulcune loy desnyée."—Labanoff, vi. 173.

did not act on his own authority. He obeyed the directions of Walsingham,[1] who had now changed his views respecting the Queen of Scots. We have seen that some months before he had recommended his mistress to set her at liberty. But his advice was not followed; and Walsingham, a thorough politician of the sixteenth century, seems now to have been of opinion, that the next best course was to take her life. The worst plan of all was to detain her a prisoner, and thus to enable her partisans to keep the kingdom in a state of perpetual alarm. While his mistress was wavering in her opinions from day to day, and Burghley was covering unnumbered sheets of foolscap in painfully elaborating every argument on every side of every question, Walsingham was ever ready to act; and it was through the instruments that he employed that Mary was eventually brought to the scaffold.

Amid all her sufferings and dangers, the irrepressible kindliness of her nature would display itself. The daughter of one of her Protestant friends in Scotland, Barbara Mowbray, had sought and obtained permission to join her in her English prison; and her secretary, Curle, having become enamoured of his countrywoman, we find Mary presenting them with the very handsome marriage gift of 2000 crowns,[2] at a time when, owing to the distracted state of France, her own finances were in anything but a flourishing condition.[3] We may add that, unlike her sister queen, who would never allow any one to marry if she could

[1] Walsingham to Paulet, 28th May 1586; Record Office.

[2] Record Office; October 1585.

[3] In a letter to Parsons some months afterwards, she says: "You know how I am used in France, and my dowry during these wars there is to

help it, Mary, notwithstanding her own unhappy experiences, was throughout her life the constant advocate of matrimony. We find her some years before offering to settle a sum of money on a French lady whom George Douglas was anxious to marry;[1] and Mary Seton, the only one of her four Marys who remained unmarried, was induced by her persuasion to accept of Andrew Beton,[2] the master of her household, and who, but for the intercession of his mistress, would have wooed the fair Seton in vain. There was one match, however, to which Mary seriously objected. Her old pupil, Bess Pierpoint, had captivated her French secretary Nau; but she saw, she said, in that young lady, "so much of her grandmother's nature,[3] notwithstanding all the pains she had taken in her education, that she would now be sorry to see her bestowed upon any man she wished 'good unto.'"[4]

Mary was still at Tutbury when she received intelligence of the return of the banished lords to Scotland, the flight of Arran, and the triumph of the English faction; and grievously though her son had offended her, her maternal interest revived when she learned that he was once more a prisoner. Writing to the French ambassador on the subject, she said: "Notwithstanding his conduct to me—which I attribute more to the evil influence of others than to his own inclination—

diminish more than ever; which notwithstanding, I would no way importune the King of Spain nor the Prince of Parma, liking a great deal better to suffer than beg."—29th May 1586; Labanoff, vi. 336.

[1] Miss Strickland, Lives of the Queens of Scotland, vii. 119-120.

[2] Ibid. Beton, however, died before the marriage took place, p. 270.

[3] The Countess of Shrewsbury.

[4] Mary to Morgan, 27th July; Record Office.

I must, as his mother, who have ever felt, and to the day of my death ever shall feel, for him the warmest affection, lament from the bottom of my heart his present miserable plight, and would make any effort, even at the hazard of my life, to secure his against the dangers which now threaten it."[1] This language might surprise us if Mary had not throughout her life shown herself to be the least vindictive of women. But the same spirit which twenty years before had prompted her to forgive the crimes of her brother and her husband, now led her, when she learned that he was in danger, to forget the baseness of her son.

Throughout the summer she had continued to complain of the unwholesome condition of her prison, and Castelnau, who left England in September, had obtained a promise from Elizabeth that she should be removed from Tutbury. But it was not until the end of December that she took final leave of that dismal place. The castle of Chartley, situated in the same county, and then belonging to the Earl of Essex, was, after much unnecessary delay, prepared for her reception; and, accompanied by her keeper and her guards, she arrived at this place on Christmas eve, 1585. There arrived at the same time as a guest of her keeper, Thomas Philipps, the decipherer and spy, who had for some years been employed by Walsingham to intercept her correspondence, and who played a very important part in the tragedy which was soon to follow.

[1] Mary to Chateauneuf, 8th December 1585; Labanoff, vi. 238.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE BABINGTON CONSPIRACY.

Although abandoned both by France and Scotland, Mary still continued to be an object of interest to Spain. The Council of Castile was not only in the habit of discussing her situation and her prospects, but, without consulting her at all upon the matter, had even about this time undertaken to provide her with a husband. Their choice fell upon the Prince of Parma, who had previously been sounded on the subject,[1] and who, like his renowned uncle Don John, was very willing to entertain the project. Nothing indeed could be more natural than the proposed arrangement. If England was ever to be invaded, Parma was the man to whom the Catholic world looked to lead the expedition; and if it proved successful, no one could have a better claim to the hand of her who, in their eyes, was the rightful sovereign. "We must," said the Council in a memorial to the king, "liberate the Queen of Scotland, and marry her to some one or another, both in order to put her out of love with her son, and to conciliate her devoted adherents. Of course the husband should be one of your majesty's

[1] Parsons to the Queen of Scots, 10th September 1584; Record Office.

nephews, and none could be so appropriate as the Prince of Parma, that great captain, whom his talents and the part he has to bear in the business, especially indicate for that honour."[1]

Of all the kings and conquerors of ancient or of modern times who have dreamed of universal empire, the monarch to whom this counsel was addressed seems to have been the most uninteresting and the most incapable. Although his industry was as great as his ambition, and although he possessed the largest navy, the finest armies, and the best commanders in the world, his obstinacy or his bigotry proved fatal to nearly all his schemes of aggrandisement. Had he possessed the abilities of his father the result might have been very different; but, fortunately for mankind, he proved himself unequal to the task of wielding the enormous resources placed at his disposal. He had thwarted the plans of the Duke of Guise for the relief of the Queen of Scots, because he had made up his mind that some day he should conquer England for himself; and he probably assented to the scheme of marrying Parma to that princess with a mental reservation that even if that very uncertain event ever did take place, it should in no way divert him from his project. Parma, meanwhile, was consulted on the subject of the invasion, and he saw many more obstacles in the way than the Council of Castile. He was far too great a soldier to underrate the magnitude of the enterprise. He knew well the character of the enemy with whom he had to deal; for although by this time he may have formed a true estimate of the vainglorious

[1] Quoted by Motley from the Archives of Simancas.—United Netherlands, i. 378.

Leicester, he had had abundant opportunities in the Netherlands of testing the qualities of English troops. He always spoke, therefore, with becoming modesty of "the enterprise of England." But he was willing to undertake it upon two conditions: the first, that the Spanish fleet should have command of the Channel; and the second, that he should have at his disposal 30,000 picked troops. With these, as the Queen of England had no standing army to oppose them, he believed he should be able to reach London; and the capital once won, he did not anticipate any further serious resistance.[1]

Such were the schemes of Parma for the year 1586. Whether or not Mary knew of his matrimonial project does not appear, but that she knew and approved of the plan of the invasion is certain. To the scheme of the Duke of Guise she had given, as we have seen, a conditional, and perhaps a reluctant consent, for she was well aware of the dangers to which an invasion of England would expose her.[2] But she was now in a very different position from that which she had occupied under the comparatively mild guardianship of the Earl of Shrewsbury. Under her new keeper, whom she knew to be a creature of Leicester, she passed her days in constant dread; and having no prospect before her now but a life of hopeless captivity, to be terminated perhaps at any moment by a violent death, it would have been strange indeed if she had rejected any scheme, however dangerous, which

[1] See letter of Parma to Philip, 20th April 1586; quoted by Motley, United Netherlands, i. 529 *et seq.*

[2] "If any unquietness should happen here, it would be laid to my charge, and so might I be in greater danger."—See Mary's conversation with John Somers; Sadler, ii. 390.

promised to restore her to liberty. We find accordingly, that in reply to a letter which by some means the Prince of Parma contrived to send to her, she gave him to understand that she entirely approved of the plan of the invasion. She did not reply to the prince directly, but in a letter to Parsons[1] she expressed herself as follows: "Give right affectionate thanks in my name to my cousin the Prince of Parma, for the honourable testimony I have had by his letter of the goodwill he beareth me, which accepting, and not now able to requite; but with the like only I pray you to let him understand for answer, that as it hath pleased the King of Spain, my good brother, to make a special choice of him to have from henceforth the whole charge and managing of the enterprise proponed for the re-establishing of this state; so inasmuch as I can for mine own part, I shall always esteem it for me no small happiness to concur in an action so important for the weal and common quieting of all Christendom with a prince so meet in all respects for effecting of the same as I see he is. And therefore, if it pleaseth him that he advise with you all in those parts of the fittest means for execution of that his good intention in the said enterprise, let him be sure that I shall therein correspond for my part with an entire acknowledgment of how much I am beholden unto him therefore,"[2] &c. No language could be more explicit. It proves conclusively that Mary was ready to risk all on the only chance that now remained for her deliverance.

[1] The companion of Campian. Parsons was at this time in the Netherlands.

[2] Labanoff, vi. 335; the Queen of Scots to Parsons, 20th May 1586.

The whole of her correspondence at this time was carried on in cipher, and it was regularly intercepted by Walsingham's spies, and deciphered by Philipps. Another important letter which she addressed on the same day to Charles Paget fell into the secretary's hands. In this letter, after alluding to the Spanish project of invasion, she said she would do her utmost to induce her son to join in the enterprise; and if he refused, she would recommend the Catholic nobility to give him up to the King of Spain, "with paction and promise to set him at liberty whensoever I shall so desire, or that after my death, being Catholic, he shall desire again to repair to this isle." She added, "I should think myself most obliged to the King of Spain that it would please him to receive my son, to make him to be instructed and reduced to the Catholic religion, which is the thing of this world I most desire, affecting a great deal rather the salvation of his soul than to see him monarch of all Europe." She further recommended that during the absence of her son, Lord Claud Hamilton should be appointed Regent of Scotland.[1] Mary had evidently, from the tone of her correspondence at this time, arrived at the conviction that her liberty was only to be obtained by force. It is not, therefore, to be denied, nor did she herself deny, that she sanctioned the scheme of invasion planned by Parma and Philip. That which from first to last she did deny, was all complicity, direct or indirect, in the contemporary plot of Anthony Babington to assassinate the Queen of England.

Whether that plot was the spontaneous effort of a

[1] The Queen of Scots to Charles Paget, 20th May 1586.; Labanoff, vi. 343.

few rash young men to liberate the Queen of Scots and restore the ancient faith, or whether they were induced to engage in it through the artifices of Walsingham or his agents, is a question which will probably ever remain in doubt. Although we may hesitate to pronounce the secretary guilty of the heavy charge which was certainly made against him at the time by persons well qualified to form a just opinion, an examination of the circumstances which led to the discovery of the conspiracy must convince us that his conduct, to say the least, was open to very strong suspicion. It is well known that he kept in his pay at this time a number of Catholic as well as Protestant spies; and one of the former, named Gilbert Gifford, is alleged to have been the real author of the Babington conspiracy. Gifford was a young man of a good Catholic family in Staffordshire. His father had been imprisoned on account of his religion, and he himself had been sent to France in his boyhood, and educated at the Jesuit seminary at Rheims. At what time and under what circumstances he was first employed by Walsingham is not known; but, from the description left of him by the French ambassador, he must have been a very young man.[1] For several months during the year 1585 we find that he was in Paris. The chief partisans of Mary in that city were her ambassador the Archbishop of Glasgow, Charles Paget, and Thomas Morgan, who was still an inmate of the Bastile. They were well aware of the rigorous nature of her imprisonment under her new keeper; and when Gifford suggested to them a plan by which she might

[1] Memoire de Chateauneuf sur la conspiration de Babington; Labanoff, vi. 275.

be enabled to communicate with her friends, they listened readily to his proposals. Like the Master of Gray, Gifford professed himself a devoted adherent of the captive queen; and the religion and the family connections of the young Jesuit disarmed all suspicion on the part of Mary's friends, who naturally regarded him as a valuable ally, and sent him in December 1585 with a strong recommendation to the French ambassador in London. It was the duty of one of the secretaries named Cordaillot to attend to the affairs of the Queen of Scots; and on Gifford presenting himself at the embassy, he explained that he had come to England for the purpose of devising some plan by which the Queen of Scots might be enabled to correspond with her friends, a privilege which was now wholly denied to her. He added that as Chartley, where she was then confined, was but a short distance from his father's house, he hoped to find some means of accomplishing this important object. On being introduced to the ambassador, M. de Chateauneuf, who had succeeded Castelnau at the Court of London, Gifford repeated his story with profound expressions of attachment to the cause of his religion and of the Queen of Scots. But he either overacted his part, or Chateauneuf was too wary to trust a stranger, who, at the very first, he suspected might be a spy of Walsingham. A number of letters were at this time lying at the embassy addressed to the Scottish queen, as her keeper had for some time past cut her off from all communication with the outer world; but Chateauneuf declined to trust any of them to the care of Gifford until he was satisfied as to his true character and objects.[1]

[1] Memoire de Chateauneuf; Labanoff, vi. 282.

Although baffled for the time, Gifford did not abandon his project. He remained in London during the whole month of January, making frequent visits to the French embassy, where various letters were addressed to him under the name of "Nicolas Cornelius." During this time, through his acquaintance with the English refugees in Paris, he obtained ready access to the houses of the principal Catholics, and to them, as well as to the French ambassador, he continued to express the utmost sympathy for the Queen of Scots. Chateauneuf, still suspicious, at length determined to put his fidelity to the test. He intrusted him with a letter containing some matter of no importance, to be transmitted to the Scottish queen. On receiving it, Gifford set out immediately for Staffordshire, and took up his residence at the house of an uncle, who lived a few miles distant from Chartley. Burton was then, as now, famed for the excellence of its beer, and he ascertained that once a-week a supply was brought to the castle by a certain brewer of that ancient town. With the knowledge and connivance of Sir Amias Paulet, Gifford introduced himself to this man, and proposed that he should become the channel of communication between the Queen of Scots and her pretended friends. The brewer, whose name has not been preserved, received from those who employed him the derisive designation of "the honest man." Being assured that Sir Amias Paulet approved of it, and expecting to be well rewarded for his trouble,[1] "the honest man" readily assented to Gifford's scheme. A small box was constructed and

[1] The "honest man" received various presents from Mary, besides being paid by Paulet.—Paulet to Walsingham, 5th July; Record Office.

made to fit into the bottom, probably a false one, of the barrel of beer, which arrived once a-week at Chartley. The butler who drew off the beer then delivered the box to one of Mary's secretaries, who opened it and handed the letters or papers which it contained to his mistress. In the following week, when the "honest man" returned, the box with the reply of the queen or her secretaries was replaced in the empty barrel, and in due time reached Gifford's hands. As the whole of Mary's correspondence was at this time carried on in cipher, the letters were then sent up to London to be deciphered. Copies were then made, and the ciphered letters were either detained or sent on to the persons to whom they were addressed, as Walsingham might determine. But whether they always left the office of the secretary in the same condition in which they reached it, is a question which it is impossible to answer in the affirmative.

The device of employing the "honest man" as the bearer of her confidential correspondence might well have awakened the suspicions of Mary. But her situation had now become so intolerable that she was evidently prepared to run any risk for the chance of recovering her liberty. She never appears to have seen Gifford; but Paget and Morgan had assured her that he might be trusted: and by means of the "honest man" she sent him a letter to be delivered to the French ambassador, in which she expressed her entire confidence in the bearer, who, she added, would explain the ingenious method he had devised for enabling her to correspond with her friends.[1]

Satisfied at length of the fidelity of Gifford,

[1] Mémoire; Labanoff, vi. 286.

Chateauneuf now intrusted him with a number of letters addressed to her, many of which had reached the embassy before Castelnau left England. Gifford, when he was in London, it was afterwards ascertained, lodged with Thomas Philipps, the decipherer. The services of yet another person were required to enable Walsingham to unfold the secrets of Mary's correspondence, and there was attached to his office one Arthur Gregory,[1] whose sole duty it was to open and counterfeit seals, an art in which he especially excelled. The web of treachery which had been woven round the captive queen was now complete. Gifford having gained the confidence of the French ambassador and corrupted the "honest man," had access to the whole of her correspondence. The letters were afterwards opened by Gregory and deciphered by Philipps. They were then, if it was determined to forward them to their destination, so carefully resealed by Gregory that the most practised eye was unable to detect the fraud. It is obvious that, as soon as this artful scheme was organised, Mary's life was in the hands of Walsingham, or, to speak more accurately, of the decipherer, Philipps. If she failed in her correspondence to criminate herself, nothing was easier than to interpolate a ciphered letter by introducing matter sufficient to bring her within the penalties of the recent statute. It will be found in the sequel that this device was eventually adopted.

Walsingham, in the mean time, was disappointed. There was nothing in the letters which Gifford brought from the French embassy which in any way implicated

[1] Arthur Gregory "sealed them up again in such sort that no man could judge they had been opened."—Camden, 305.

the Queen of Scots, for not one of them was produced against her; and with the view of strengthening her confidence in the "honest man," they probably all reached Chartley through his hands.

Gifford had arranged that during his absence from Staffordshire a Catholic friend of his, named Thomas Barnes, who was no doubt kept in ignorance of the fraud, should, on the occasion of the weekly visits of the "honest man," receive any packets sent off from Chartley. He was then to forward them as speedily as possible to the house of another friend who lived in Warwickshire, on the road to London, and the latter sent them on to the French embassy in the care of a messenger who always wore some kind of disguise.[1] After waiting twenty-four hours in London, he returned with whatever letters there might be for the Scottish queen, but which had all previously passed through the hands of Gifford, Gregory, Philipps, and Walsingham.

Having thus successfully accomplished his traitorous purpose, Gifford repaired to France to apprise Mary's friends that he had established a sure means by which they could now regularly correspond with her. Various

[1] Gifford explained to Chateauneuf his plan of operations as follows: "Qu'entre Londres et Chartley, il y avait deux maisons de gentilshommes catholiques, ses amis; que le plus proche de Chartley enverrait toutes les semaines quérir les lettres chez le faiseur de bière puis les enverrait chez l'autre gentilhomme plus proche de Londres, lequel les enverrait à Londres," &c. The letters were then delivered at the French embassy to be sent on to their destination.—Labanoff, vi. 285. It would appear from this statement that the person last mentioned—namely, the friend who lived nearest to London—must have been in the plot, as it would be necessary for him to send whatever letters or packets he received in the first instance to Walsingham's office to be deciphered before they were delivered at the French embassy. Gifford assured Chateauneuf that neither of his two friends was in the secret; but this we cannot believe, as in that case Mary's letters would have found their way straight to the French embassy without being examined by Walsingham.

consultations were held, and various opinions were expressed respecting the means of liberating the royal captive; but it was finally suggested by the young Jesuit that it would be dangerous to attempt to rescue her by force, as in case of any alarm Paulet would instantly cause her to be put to death. On the other hand, if Elizabeth were in the first instance made away with,[1] the Queen of Scots would be at once acknowledged by the leading nobility, and no opposition was to be apprehended from the people to the undoubted heiress of the crown. It appears that Mendoza, who was now Philip's ambassador in Paris, and who, on account of his expulsion from England, entertained the deadliest hostility against Elizabeth, warmly approved of the assassination scheme, and promised to aid in its execution to the utmost of his power.[2]

Gifford now returned to London, where, among his Catholic acquaintances, he met a young man named Anthony Babington who seemed to be an instrument in every way fitted for his designs. Babington possessed a good estate in Derbyshire, and in his youth, according to the fashion of the age, had spent some time as a page in the service of the Earl of Shrewsbury. In that capacity he had often seen, admired, and pitied the Queen of Scots. Wholly inexperienced in political intrigue,[3] and endowed with

[1] "Voilà les desseins du dit Gifford projetés à Paris par gens mal pratiqués du monde, et qui se laissèrent aller aux propositions du dit Gifford," &c.—Labanoff, vi. 287.

[2] "A cette occasion, le dit Mendoza n'oublia rien de belles promesses, tant au dit Gifford et à ceux qui etaient à Paris, qu'aux autres qui étaient en Angleterre pour les inciter, aux promesses d'une armée de mer et de tous les moyens de son maitre."—Ibid.

[3] "Il etait fort jeune sans barbe et assez simple."—Chauteauneuf in Labanoff, vi. 298.

an abundant share of youthful vanity, he soon became as wax in the practised hands of Gifford. But although willing to risk his life in the service of the captive queen, Babington, it is said, at first recoiled from the project of assassinating her rival. He entertained such strong religious scruples on the subject, that in order to remove them, Gifford set out once more for France, and returned to London accompanied by an English priest named Ballard. This man had originally been a spy of Walsingham, but having become disgusted with his occupation, was eager to repair the wrongs he had done to his fellow-Catholics by rendering them some signal service. Another person arrived in London shortly afterwards who volunteered to kill Elizabeth with his own hand. This was a soldier of fortune, named John Savage, who had served in the Netherlands under the Prince of Parma, and who, as it afterwards appeared, had been first instigated by an uncle of Gifford to undertake the murder.[1] The arguments of Ballard, and the fierce fanaticism of Savage, who had long been inured to scenes of blood in the desperate warfare of the Netherlands, at length overcame the scruples of Babington. He even began to envy Savage the glory he would acquire by ridding the world of the heretic queen. He maintained that the enterprise was too hazardous and too important to be undertaken by any one man, and he proposed instead that the number of assassins should be increased to six. Babington had many friends in London, young men of his own age and station, to whom, with the consent of Gifford and Ballard, he now disclosed the plan of the conspiracy. Among

[1] State Trials, i. 1129.

these he selected five who agreed to join him in the plot. These were Chidiock Titchbourne, the representative of an ancient family in Hampshire; Charles Tilney, one of the band of gentlemen pensioners of the queen; Edward Abington, whose father had held an appointment in the queen's household; John Charnock of Lancashire; and an Irishman named Barnwell, who is said by Camden to have been a cadet of a noble house.[1] Various other friends of Babington agreed to join in the plan for the rescue of the Queen of Scots, which was to be effected immediately after the death of Elizabeth. Among them were Edward Windsor, a brother of Lord Windsor, Thomas Salisbury of Denbighshire, Robert Gage of Surrey, John Travers of Lancashire, and a man named Pooley, who had acquired the entire confidence of Babington, and followed him about wherever he went. He was one of the numerous spies of Walsingham, and had most probably been introduced by Gifford to keep a watch on the conspirators while he himself was absent from London. Another of Walsingham's creatures, named Maude, had for some time past been the constant companion of Ballard, who, disguised as a soldier of fortune, had visited various parts of England and Scotland, with the view of ascertaining the condition and the prospects of the Catholic population.

Babington and his friends were now fairly in the toils of Walsingham. Wholly unconscious of their danger, they meanwhile daily met and discussed their plans. That they might converse more freely, they usually repaired, as if for recreation, to St Giles's in the Fields; and we may conclude that on

[1] Camden, 303.

each occasion one at least of Walsingham's three spies took care to be present: and we may perhaps attribute to their insidious advice a piece of egregious folly on the part of Babington, who was so elated with his scheme of killing the queen that he had a painting executed containing portraits of the six conspirators, with himself in the most prominent position as their chief.[1]

Against them Walsingham was now in possession of ample evidence, but he aimed from the first at higher game. The Queen of Scots was as yet in no way implicated in the plot; and in spite of the ingenuity of Gifford, nothing had been discovered in her correspondence which would subject her to the penalties of the recent statute. It is obvious that her friends had the strongest motives for keeping her in ignorance of Babington's plot. Upon this point Mr Froude justly remarks: "If there was a person from whom the conspiracy ought most carefully to have been concealed, that person was Mary Stewart. She could herself do nothing; and to acquaint her beforehand with so dark a purpose was to expose her to gratuitous danger, and was to ask her for a direct sanction which she could not honourably give."[2] We find, accordingly, that Morgan, who, whatever may have been his misdeeds, was a faithful friend to her, informed her that Dr Gifford, who had first proposed to Savage to kill the queen, and who was at this time in England, was "occupied in such matters as be not to be neglected. The par-

[1] Camden, 304. He adds that beneath the picture was the following line—

"Hi mihi sunt comites, quos ipsa pericula ducunt."

[2] Vol. xii. 231.

ticularities I would recount unto your majesty, *but I hold it best for some causes that you do not know the same.*"[1] Morgan further cautioned Mary against corresponding with Ballard, who, he said, was engaged in "some matters of consequence, the issue whereof is uncertain. Wherefore, as long as these labours of his and matters be in hand, it is not for your majesty's service to hold any intelligence with him at all, for fear lest he or his partners be discovered, and they by pains or other accidents *discover your majesty afterwards to have had intelligence with them,* which I would not should fall out for any good in the world; and I have specially warned the said Ballard not to deal at any hand with your majesty, *so long as he followeth the affairs that he and others have in hand,* which tend to do good, which I pray God may come to pass, and so shall your majesty be relieved by the power of God."[2]

There can be no doubt that in these two letters Morgan referred to the Babington plot, with the nature of which, for obvious reasons, he wished to keep his mistress unacquainted. But it is a startling fact that while he was giving her this salutary advice, we find him in another letter recommending her to open up a correspondence with the chief of the conspiracy—namely, with Babington himself. If all three letters are genuine, it is impossible to explain the inconsistency. But bearing in mind that they all passed through the hands of Gifford and Philipps before they reached Mary, and bearing in mind that Walsingham was at this time in want of evidence to connect her with the plot, we cannot but strongly suspect that the

[1] Morgan to the Queen of Scots, 24th April 1586; Murdin, 512.
[2] Murdin, 527; letter of 4th July.

fatal advice which now reached her came not from a friend but from an enemy.

"I am of opinion," says Morgan, in this most suspicious letter, "that it shall not be amiss that your majesty write three or four lines of your own hand to the said Babington, declaring your good conceit of him, and the confidence you repose in him, and thank him for his good affection towards your majesty,"[1] &c. Another singular circumstance connected with this letter is the fact that Morgan, who was still a prisoner in the Bastille, even took upon himself to draw up a short note which Mary might copy out and send to Babington. When we consider that Mary was one of the most accomplished letter-writers that ever lived, we cannot but feel surprise that Morgan, or any one else, should have ventured on such a liberty. But whether the letter came from Morgan or from Philipps, it produced the result desired by her enemies: It drew from her a short letter to Babington, and expressed in the very words dictated by Morgan.[2] It is important to observe that this was the first piece of evidence produced against her. Although by means of his spies Walsingham had perused every scrap of correspondence which passed to and from the Scottish queen for upwards of four months, he had found nothing which he thought fit to produce. This is a circumstance which weighs immensely in her favour, while it must have grievously disappointed her enemies, whose ingenuity had hitherto been exercised in vain. The

[1] Murdin, 513; letter of 9th May.

[2] "Et la première que la dite Royne d'Ecosse luy escrivit fust suyvant une minutte en voyée de mot à mot toute faicte par Morgan." —Declaration of Nau; Labanoff, vii. 208.

strong motive which they had at this time for involving her in the guilt of the Babington plot is therefore abundantly apparent.

The letter of Mary to Babington, copied from the alleged draft of Morgan, was as follows:—

"My very good friend,—Albeit it be long since you heard from me, not more than I have done from you, it is against my will; yet would I not you should think I have in the meanwhile, nor ever will be, unmindful of the effectual affection you have showed heretofore towards all that concerneth me. I have understood that, upon the renewing of your intelligence, there were addressed unto you, both from France and Scotland, some packets for me; I pray you, if any be come to your hands, and be yet in place, to deliver them to the bearer thereof, who will safely convey them unto me; and I will pray to God for your preservation. Your assured good friend."—Chartley, June 25th.[1]

The request that any packets in his possession should be given to the bearer is highly suggestive of fraud, and strengthens our suspicion that this letter was not a genuine composition. It reached Babington in London by the hand of an "unknown boy." But before it was delivered a correspondence of a very mysterious kind had taken place between Paulet, Walsingham, and Philipps. On the 27th of June, a packet from Philipps arrived at Chartley, to be delivered through the "honest man" to the Queen of Scots; but its contents were such that Paulet declined to send it. He wrote both to Walsingham and Philipps that he could not venture to put their scheme in execution, as he considered it to be highly dangerous, and that it

[1] State Trials, i. 1174; and Labanoff, vi. 345.

might lead to the discovery and defeat of their plan of operations.

As to the contents of the packet which Paulet refused to deliver to the Queen of Scots, we are wholly in the dark; but it is impossible to resist the conclusion that some foul play was meditated by Philipps. Paulet says that his plan would be attended with "imminent danger." But if the letters or papers which the packet contained were genuine, there could have been no danger in transmitting them to the Scottish queen through the ordinary channel, which both parties now regarded as secure.

In acknowledging the receipt of the packet to Walsingham, Paulet expressed himself as follows: "Mr Philipps hath set down a course for many things to be done which *surely I dare not put in execution for fear of the worst;* wherein I am also the more fearful because it seemeth there is hope that the 3d of this present great matter will come from this people, which might be in danger to be stayed if any cause of suspicion were ministered to any of the agents in this intercourse." He adds: "All is now well, thanks be to God; and I should think myself very unhappy if, upon any instructions to proceed from me, this intercourse, so well advanced, should be overthrown. I have therefore resolved to open the returned packet, and to deliver only to the honest man the letter for the second messenger therein contained."[1]

Paulet at the same time wrote to Philipps himself, saying that he "dare not proceed to the execution" of his directions, that he had therefore returned his packet, and that he had explained his reasons for so

[1] See Appendix E.

doing more fully to Secretary Walsingham. It was apparently in consequence of the difficulties thus raised by Paulet that Philipps was sent down to Chartley shortly afterwards to take into his own hands the management of the affair.

On what day Mary's letter reached Babington we are not informed; nor do we know the date of his alleged reply. She is said to have received it on the 12th of July, and it was to the following effect. We have marked some passages in italics which especially deserve attention.

"Most mighty, most excellent, my dread sovereign, lady and queen, unto whom I owe all fidelity and obedience; may it please your gracious majesty to admit excuse of my long silence and discontinuance from those dutiful offices, intercepted upon the remove of your royal person from the ancient place of your abode to the custody of a wicked Puritan and mere Leicestrian—a mortal enemy, both by faith and faction, to your majesty and to the Catholic estate. I held the hope of our country's weal depending (next under God) upon the life of your majesty to be desperate, and thereupon resolved to depart the realm, determining to spend the remnant of my life in such solitary sort as the miserable and wretched estate of my country doth require; only expecting, according to the just judgment of God, the present confusion thereof, which God, for His mercy's sake, prevent. The which my purpose being in execution, and standing upon my departure, there was addressed unto me, from the parts beyond the seas, one Ballard, a man of virtue and learning, and of singular zeal to the Catholic cause and your majesty's service. The man informed me of

great preparations by the Christian princes, your majesty's allies, for the deliverance of our country from the extreme and miserable estate wherein for a long time it hath remained; which, when I understood, my especial desire was to advise by what means I might, with the regard of my life, and all my friends in general, do your sacred majesty one day's good service. Whereupon, most dread sovereign, according to the great care which those princes have of the preservation and safe deliverance of your majesty's sacred person, I advised of means and considered of circumstances accordingly, to and with so many of the wisest and most trusty, as with safety I might commend the secrecy thereof unto. I do find, by the assistance of the Lord Jesus, assurance of good effect, and desired fruit of our travail. These things are first to be advised in this great and honourable action, upon issue of which dependeth not only the life of your most excellent majesty, which God long preserve to our inestimable comfort and to the salvation of English souls, and the lives of all us actors therein, but also the honour and weal of our country, far more dear than our lives unto us, and the last hope to recover the faith of our forefathers, and to redeem ourselves from the servitude and bondage which hereby heretofore hath been imposed upon us with the loss of many thousand souls. First, for the assuring of invasions, sufficient strength on the invaders' parts to arrive is appointed, with a strong party at every place to join with them and warrant their landing, the deliverance of your majesty, *the despatch of the usurping competitor.*[1] For the effecting of all, may it please

[1] We should have expected to find in a genuine letter "*and* the de-

your majesty to rely upon my service. I protest before the Almighty, who hath long miraculously preserved your royal person, no doubt to some universal good, that what I have said shall be performed, or all our lives happily lost in the execution thereof. Which vow all the chief actors have taken solemnly, and are upon assurance by your majesty to me to receive the blessed sacrament thereupon, either to prevail in the Church's behalf and your majesty's, or fortunately to die for so honourable a cause."[1]

We must here call the attention of the reader to the passage we have marked in italics. It is admitted that the conspirators had the strongest motives for concealing from Mary the plot against Elizabeth's life, yet she is here not only informed of it, but it is referred to in the very plainest terms, without preface or explanation of any kind. Mary heard for the first time in this letter of the intended plot, yet Babington speaks of "the despatch of the usurping competitor" as if it had been a matter with which she was already well acquainted. Even in this sanguinary age we find no other instance in which an intended murder is spoken of in such undisguised and unambiguous terms. If the passage is genuine, it is impossible to explain why it was inserted. If it is spurious, the motive of the interpolator is clear. It was simply to impart to Mary a knowledge of the murderous plot, and to draw from her in reply some expression of assent or approval which would subject her to the penalties of the recent statute.

spatch." There are three copies of this letter in the Record Office, two English and one French, and in all three the "and" is omitted.—See Record Office, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. xviii.

[1] State Trials, i. 1175.

We proceed with the remainder of Babington's letter:—

"Now forasmuch as delays are extreme dangerous, it might please your most excellent majesty by your wisdom to direct us, and by your princely authority to enable us, and such as may advance the affairs; foreseeing there is not any of the nobility at liberty assured to your majesty in this desperate service, except unknown to us; and seeing that it is very necessary that some there should be to become heads to lead the multitude who are disposed by nature in this land to follow nobility; considering withal, it doth not only make the commons and country to follow without contradiction or contention, which is ever found in equality, but also doth add great courage to the leaders. For which necessary regards I would recommend some to your majesty as are fittest, in my knowledge, to be your lieutenants in the west parts, in the north parts, South Wales and North Wales, the countries of Lancaster, Derby, and Stafford. In all which countries parties being already made, and fidelity taken in your majesty's name, I hold them as most assured and of undoubted fidelity. Myself, with ten gentlemen of quality, and an hundred followers, will undertake the delivery of your person from the hands of your enemies; and *for the despatch of the usurper, from obedience of whom, by the excommunication of her, we are made free, there be six noble gentlemen, all my private friends, who, for the zeal they bear the Catholic cause and your majesty's service, will undertake the tragical execution.* It resteth that according to their infinite deserts, and your majesty's bounty, their heroical attempts may be honourably rewarded in

them, if they escape with life, or in their posterity; and that so much by your majesty's authority I may be able to assure them. Now it remaineth only in your majesty's wisdom that it be reduced into method, *that your happy deliverance be first, for that thereupon dependeth the only good,* and that the other circumstances concur—that the untimely end of the one do not overthrow the rest. All which your majesty's wonderful experience and wisdom will dispose in so good manner as I doubt not, through God's good assistance, shall take deserved effect; for the obtaining of which every one of us shall think his life most happily spent. Upon the 12th day of this month I will be at Litchfield, expecting your majesty's answers and letters, to execute what by them shall be commanded. Your majesty's faithful subject and sworn servant, ANTHONY BABINGTON."

In this portion of the letter Mary is informed that there is a matter more important still than the murder of her rival, and that is her own deliverance from captivity, "for that thereupon dependeth the only good." Babington himself, with ten gentlemen of quality and a hundred followers, was to undertake this perilous duty; while "six noble gentlemen"—all his private friends—were to despatch Elizabeth. But how could this be? Was not Babington himself one of the six? Was he not their acknowledged chief? How could he be employed at the same time in London and at Chartley—130 miles distant? These inconsistencies and contradictions, as the letter now stands, it is impossible to explain; but if we strike out the two passages relating to the murder of Elizabeth, it be-

comes at once intelligible and consistent. It would still contain treasonable matter enough as regarded Babington; for the projected invasion, the rising of the Catholics, and the plan for the deliverance of the captive queen, are all discussed in language abundantly explicit. But as regarded her, additional evidence was required.

If we had any sufficient proof that the letter was genuine, these remarks would be impertinent. But it is admitted that the alleged copy which was produced, and is now preserved, came from the office of Walsingham—the original having been intercepted by Gifford, opened by Gregory, and deciphered by Philipps. Who can assert that it left their hands in the same condition in which it reached them? Gifford, we know, was well acquainted with the plot against Elizabeth; indeed we can hardly doubt that it was he who first suggested it. Philipps[1] was equally aware of the conspiracy; and nothing would be easier than to insert in the letter sent to Mary some reference to the fact. The two passages printed in italics are the only ones in which allusion is made to the intended murder of the English queen; and it is to be observed that they are introduced in the most abrupt and startling manner, and have no connection with the remaining portions of the letter.

It is upon this suspicious document, and the answer which Mary is alleged to have returned to it, that the charge against her of having conspired against the life of Elizabeth entirely rests. It is necessary, therefore, to follow step by step the measures now taken by Wal-

[1] Philipps, it appears, was an adept in forgery as well as in the art of deciphering.—See Tytler, vol. viii., Appendix xiv., where conclusive proof of this fact may be found.

singham to connect her with the plot. We have seen that in Babington's letter he says he would be at Litchfield on the 12th of July, and would there await her answer. Upon that everything now depended; and in order that no time might be lost in obtaining it, Walsingham directed Philipps to proceed at once to Chartley, that, as soon as Mary's reply reached him through the hands of the "honest man," it might be opened and deciphered on the spot.

Philipps left London on the 7th, and arrived at Chartley on the 9th of July. On the same day Walsingham wrote a confidential letter to the Earl of Leicester, in which he alluded in very mysterious terms to something of importance that was about to happen, which he could not commit to writing, but which would be communicated to him by the bearer of the letter. "I have acquainted this gentleman," he says, "with the secret, to the end he may impart the same unto your lordship. I dare make none of my servants here privy thereunto. My only fear is that her majesty will not use the matter with that secrecy that appertaineth, though it imports it as greatly as ever anything did since she came to this crown; and surely, if the matter be well handled, it will break the neck of all dangerous practices during her majesty's reign. *I pray your lordship make this letter an heretic after you have read the same.* I mean, when the matter is grown to a full ripeness, to send some confidential person unto you to acquaint you fully with the matter. And so in the mean time I most humbly take my leave."[1]

[1] Leicester Correspondence, 342. "Walsingham," says Mr Bruce in his Introduction, p. 37, "wished his correspondent to make a 'heretic' of that letter as soon as he had read it; but the earl contented himself

There can be no doubt that Walsingham here alluded to the Babington plot; and the confident tone in which he boasts that if "the matter be well handled" it would break the neck of all dangerous practices during Elizabeth's reign, is highly significant. The suspicion naturally arises, if he expected this conspiracy to be productive of such extraordinary advantages, that he was himself a party to it. It must be remembered that, when he so expressed himself, he was still without any evidence against the Queen of Scots; yet he had no doubt that he would obtain it: and when the matter was "grown to a full ripeness," he would let Leicester know more. Walsingham knew that Philipps had carried with him at this time to Chartley Babington's letter to Mary; and upon her reply—provided "it were well handled"—everything would now depend.

Two days after the date of this letter, Walsingham received a commuication from Gilbert Gifford, to which it is necessary to call the attention of the reader.

Gifford, who was at the time in London, informed the secretary that he had just had an interview with Ballard, in whose opinion it was absolutely necessary, before proceeding with the conspiracy, to obtain the sanction of the Queen of Scots in her own handwriting. "I asked him," said Gifford in his letter to Walsingham, "what was to be done on our parts; he (Ballard) replied that I must needs obtain of ⊖[1] her hand and seal to allow of all that should be practised for her behalf, without the which, said he, we labour

with running his pen through the more important sentences. I fear they bear a construction not over favourable to the English Government, but I must content myself with merely directing attention to them."

[1] The Queen of Scots.—See the letter of Gifford, Appendix F.

in vain, and these men will not hear us. I answered that it was a matter of great importance, and that we should expect Morgan and Paget to do it; he said the matter would grow long, and that he was in great danger."

After some further conversation, Gifford continued, "Well, said I, let us think of it, and to-morrow I will answer you; so he parted out of town, and left his man with me for answer, which he is marvellous earnest in. *What your honour thinketh good, I shall answer him.* I desire to be informed, and how far I shall join with him and keep him company," &c.

Whether any such conversation took place between Ballard and Gifford, such as the latter here describes, may be well doubted. Ballard was a veteran conspirator, and it is highly improbable that he should have suggested the dangerous expedient of obtaining the written sanction of the Queen of Scots to the assassination plot. But it is by no means improbable that Gifford, well knowing the precise kind of evidence which Walsingham at this time was anxious to obtain against her, may have himself invented the story of his interview with Ballard.

One thing in any case is clear, whether the suggestion came from Ballard or from Gifford himself—it is to Walsingham he applies for instructions and advice. He awaits his orders as to whether or not an attempt shall be made to obtain from the Queen of Scots her written sanction to the murder of her cousin. Why should he look to Walsingham for directions upon such a point? How could he help them to obtain the handwriting they so much desired? The only possible answer to these questions is that Walsingham was an accomplice with his subordinates Gifford and Philipps

in bringing Mary to the block; that they did not move a step without first consulting him; and that he was, therefore, perfectly cognisant of the fraudulent practices to which they resorted to effect their purpose.

What answer Walsingham returned to Gifford we do not know; but it is a circumstance of extreme significance that, within five days of the date of Gifford's letter, Mary's enemies asserted that they had in their possession written evidence of her assent to the plot.

On the 12th of July, Babington's letter reached Mary through the ordinary channel. On the following day her secretary Nau wrote a short note to Babington acknowledging the receipt of his letter, and informing him that an answer would be returned to it in three days. Nau's note was intercepted, read, and sent on to its destination; and, in acquainting Walsingham with its contents, Philipps, still more confident than his chief in the success of their plot, exclaimed, "*We attend her very heart at the next.*"[1]

Meanwhile the arrival of Philipps at Chartley, and the attention which he received from her keeper, had attracted Mary's notice. She was now stronger, and better able, in the fine summer weather, to take outdoor exercise than she had been for some time past; and in one of her rides she met the stranger who had awakened her curiosity, and whose appearance she thus described in a letter to Morgan: "He was," she said, "of low stature, with dark yellow hair, and beard of lighter colour, with a downcast look, marked with the smallpocks, and about thirty years of age."[2]

[1] Philipps to Walsingham; Record Office, 14th July.

[2] The portrait, which Philipps deciphered himself from Mary's intercepted letter, is not attractive.

Philipps, too, described his meeting with the Scottish queen. He met her, he said, "with a smiling countenance;"[1] but he had failed to lull the suspicions of his victim, who, from her description of the man, evidently regarded him with instinctive antipathy. It must have been an anxious time for Walsingham, who had taken upon himself the sole responsibility of following out the Babington conspiracy in all its ramifications. But by means of his spies, Gifford, Maude, and Pooley, he was kept informed of everything that the conspirators in London said and did; and he only awaited the return of Philipps from Chartley, with some definite evidence against the Queen of Scots, to lay the whole matter before the Council. Nor was he disappointed, for Philipps made his appearance with the much-desired proof even sooner than was expected.

Unfortunately for Mary, Babington's fatal letter reached her at a time when she was overwhelmed with grief at the final desertion of her son.[2] The treaty recently concluded between him and Elizabeth left Mary no hope of liberty but in the success of a Spanish invasion, aided by a general rising of the Catholics throughout the kingdom. If the remedy seemed desperate, it must be remembered that her situation had become intolerable; and to risk her life in an attempt to regain her liberty was not more hazardous than to remain a hopeless prisoner, in

[1] Philipps to Walsingham, 14th July; Record Office.

[2] "Ceste maudite lettre vint à la malheure sur le très grief ressentiment que la dite Royne d'Escosse avoit de se voir séparée du roy son fils, négligée en la ligue faicte à part avecques luy et privée, comme elle estoit informée de son droict prétendu à la succession de la dite Royne d'Angleterre," &c.—Mémoire de Nau of 10th September 1586; Labanoff, vii. 208.

constant dread of assassination. Actuated by these feelings, she on the 17th of July addressed a long letter to Babington, in reply to the one she had received from him. If the copy of Mary's letter produced at Fotheringay was genuine, she approved not only of the plan of invasion and of the rising of the Catholics, but of the murder of Elizabeth. But there are very strong reasons for believing that it was tampered with after it left her hands, and that the passages marked in italics were not composed by her.

MARY'S ALLEGED ANSWER TO BABINGTON.

"Trusty and well-beloved,—According to the zeal and entire affection which I have known in you towards the common cause of religion, and since having always made account of you as a principal and right worthy member to be employed both in the one and in the other, it hath been no less consolation unto me to know your estate, as I have done by your last letter, and to have further means to renew my intelligence with you than I have felt griefs all this while past to be without the same. I pray you, therefore, to write unto me hereafter so often as you can of all concurrents which you may judge in any sort importunate to the good of mine affairs, wherein I shall not fail to correspond with all the care and diligence that shall be by possibility. For divers great and importunate considerations, which were here too long to be deducted, I cannot but greatly praise and commend your common desire to prevent in time the designment of our enemies for the extirpation of our religion out of this realm, with the ruin of us all; for I have long ago showed to the foreign Catholic princes what they have done against

the King of Spain, and in the time the Catholics here remaining exposed to all persecutions and cruelty, do daily diminish in number, forces, means, and power, so as if remedy be not thereunto speedily provided, I fear not a little but that they shall become altogether unable for ever to rise again to receive any aid at all whensoever it is offered. Then for my own part I pray you assure our principal friends that albeit I had no particular interest in this case, that all that I may pretend unto, being of no consideration to me in respect of the public good of the State, I shall be always ready, and most willing to employ therein my life and all that I have, or may look for in this world. Now to ground substantially this enterprise, and to bring it to good success, you must examine duly (1) what forces, as well on foot as on horse, you may raise among you all, and what captain you shall appoint for them in every shire, in case a general cannot be had; (2) which towns, ports, and havens you may assure yourselves, as well on the north, west, and south, to receive succour as well from the Low Countries, Spain, and France, as from other parts; (3) what place you esteem fittest and of most advantage to assemble the principal company of your forces at the same time, which would be compassed conform to the proportion of your own; (4) for how long pay and munition, and what ports are fittest for their landing in this realm from the foresaid three foreign countries; (5) what provision of monies and armour, in case you should want, you would ask; (6) *by what means do the six gentlemen deliberate to proceed;* (7) the manner of my getting forth of this hold,—which points having taken amongst you who are the principal actors, and

also as few in number as you can, the best resolution in my desire is that you impart the same with all diligence to Bernardino de Mendoza, ambassador for the King of Spain in France, who, besides the experience he hath of the estate on this side, I may assure you will employ himself most willingly. I shall not fail to write to him of the matter with all the recommendations I can, as also I shall do in any wise that shall be needful. But you must take choice men for the managing of the affairs with the said Mendoza and others out of the realm, of some faithful and very secret, both in wisdom and personage, unto whom only you must commit yourselves, to the end things may be kept the more secret, which for your own security I commend to yourself. If your messenger bring you back again sure promise and sufficient assurance of the succours which you demand, then thereafter (but not sooner, for that it were in vain) take diligent order that all those on your part make, secretly as they can, provision of armour, fit horses, and ready money, wherewith to hold themselves in a readiness to march so soon as it shall be signified unto you by the chief and principal of every shire; and for the better colouring of the matter, reserving to the principals the knowledge of the ground of the enterprise. It shall be enough at the beginning to give it out to the rest that the said provisions are made only for the fortifying of yourselves in case of need against the Puritans of this realm, the principal whereof having the chief forces thereof in the Low Countries, as you may let the bruit go disguised, do seek the ruin and overthrow at their return home of the Catholics, and to usurp the crown not only against me and all other lawful pretenders

thereto, but against their own queen that now is, if she will not altogether submit herself to their government. These pretexts may serve to found and establish among all associations, or confederations general, as done only for your preservation and defence, as well in religion as lands, lives, and goods, against the oppression and attempts of the said Puritans, without directly writing or giving out anything against the queen, but rather showing yourselves willing to maintain her and her lawful heirs after her, not naming me. The affairs being thus prepared, and forces in readiness both within and without the realm, then *shall it be time to set the gentlemen on work, taking good order upon the accomplishment of their design.*[1] I may be suddenly transported out of this place, and meet without tarrying for the arrival of the foreign aid, which then must be hastened with all diligence, *now for that there can be no certain day appointed for the accomplishment of the said gentlemen's designment, to the end others may be in readiness to take me from hence. I would that the said gentlemen had always about them, or at least at Court, divers and sundry scoutmen, furnished with good and speedy horses, as soon as the design shall be executed, to come with all diligence to advertise me thereof, and those that shall be appointed for my transporting; to the end that immediately after they may be at the place of my abode before my keeper can have advertise-*

[1] In the State Trials, "their discharges," i. 1179. The whole passage has been most carelessly translated. In the French the meaning is clear: "Il faudra *alors mettre les six gentilshommes en besoigne et* donner ordre que *leur desseing estant effectué,* je puisse quant et quant, estre tirée hors d'icy," &c.—Labanoff, vi. 389. I assume that the words in italics have been interpolated.

ment of the execution of the said designment, or at the least, before he can fortify himself within the house, or carry me out of the same. It were necessary to dispatch two or three of the said advertisers by divers ways, to the end if one be staid the other may come through; at the same instant it were needful to assay to cut off the posts ordinary ways." [1]

It is to be observed that on her arraignment at Fotheringay, Mary admitted — at least she did not deny — that in order to regain her liberty she had approved of the projected invasion; but she most emphatically denied that she was in any way implicated in the plot against Elizabeth's life. But if the passages in italics were written by her, or by her authority, she was clearly a party to the plot; for she gives express instructions that the death of Elizabeth was to be the first act of the conspirators, and that they should then announce the fact as speedily as possible to her. Let us see how these instructions agree with what follows. The letter proceeds thus :—

"This is the plot that I think best for this enterprise, and the order whereby we shall conduct the same for our common security; for stirring on this side before you be sure of sufficient foreign forces, that were for nothing but to put ourselves in danger of following the miserable fortune of such as have heretofore travailed in the like actions;[2] and if you take me out of this place, be well assured to set me in the midst of a good army, or some very good strength, where I may safely stay till the assembly of your forces and

[1] In the French, "d'empescher les passages ordinaires aux postes et courriers."—Labanoff, vi. 390.

[2] Allusion is here made to the northern rebellion of 1569, and the conspiracy of the Duke of Norfolk.

arrival of the said foreign succours. IT WERE SUFFICIENT CAUSE GIVEN TO THE QUEEN, IN CATCHING ME AGAIN, TO ENCLOSE ME IN SOME HOLD, OUT OF THE WHICH I SHOULD NEVER ESCAPE, if she did use me no worse, and to pursue with all extremity those that assisted me, which would grieve me more than all the unhappiness might fall upon myself."

How are we to reconcile this extraordinary passage with that which immediately precedes it? Mary first directs that her rival is to be killed. She is then to be apprised of the fact as speedily as possible, and placed in the midst of a powerful army; and why? Lest her dead rival should catch her again, and treat her worse than ever. We here distinctly trace the forger's hand. He had evidently forgotten, that according to the plan he had sketched out Elizabeth was already dead. That Mary could have written such arrant nonsense it is impossible to believe. But if we strike out the murderous passages in the letter, her expressions of alarm lest she should a second time fall into the hands of her rival would be perfectly natural, and consistent with the plan of the invasion which she had certainly at this time sanctioned, and to all the dangers attending which she was fully alive.

Mary's letter proceeds:—

"Earnestly as you can, look and take heed most carefully and vigilantly to compass and assure all so well that shall be necessary for the effecting of the said enterprise, as with the grace of God you may bring the same to happy end, remitting to the judgment of your principal friends on this side, with whom you have to deal, therein to ordain and conclude upon these points which may serve you for an overture of

such propositions as you shall amongst you find best; and to yourself in particular I refer the gentlemen aforementioned to be assured of all that should be requisite for the entire execution of their goodwills. I leave their common resolution to advice; in case the design do not take hold, as may happen whether they will or no, do not pursue my transport, and the execution of the rest of the enterprise. But if the mishap should fall out that you might not come by me, being set in the Tower of London, or in any other strength, with strong guard, yet, notwithstanding, leave not, for God's sake, to proceed in the enterprise, for I shall at any time die most contentedly understanding of your delivery out of the servitude wherein you are holden as slaves. I shall assay, that at the same time that the work shall be in hand, at that present to make the Catholics of Scotland to rise and put my son in their hands, to the effect that from thence our enemies here may not prevail by any succour. I would also that some stirring were in Ireland, and that it were laboured to begin some time before anything be done here, and then that the alarm might begin thereby on the flat contrary side. That the stroke may come from your designs, to have some general, or chief head, are very pertinent; and therefore were it good to send obscurely for the purpose to the Earl of Arundel,[1] or some of his brethren, and likewise to seek to the young Earl of Northumberland, if he be at liberty from over the sea; the Earl of Westmoreland may be had, whose hand and name, you know, may do much in the north parts; also the Lord Paget, of good ability in some

[1] This passage is unintelligible; for, as Mary herself observed on her trial, Arundel was at this time a prisoner in the Tower.

shires thereabouts. Both the one and the other may be had, amongst whom secretly some more principal banished may return, if the enterprise be once resolute. The said Lord Paget is now in Spain, and may treat of all that by his brother Charles, or directly by himself, you will commit unto him touching the affairs. Beware that none of your messengers that you send forth of the realm carry any letters upon themselves; but make their despatches, and send them either after or before them by some others. Take heed of spies and false brethren that are amongst you, especially of some priests, already practised upon by your enemies for your discovery; and in any case, keep never a paper about you that may in any sort do harm, for from like errors have come the condemnation of all such as have suffered heretofore, against whom otherwise nothing could justly have been proved. Discover as little as you can your names and intentions to the French ambassador at London; for although, as I understand, he is a very honest gentleman, yet I fear his master entertaineth a course far contrary to our designment, which may move him to discover us if he had any particular knowledge thereof. All this while I have sued to change and remove from this house, and for answer the Castle of Dudley only hath been named to serve the turn; so as by appearance about the end of this summer I may go thither. Therefore advise as soon as I shall be there what provision may be had about that part for my escape from thence. If I stay here, there is but one of these three ways or means to be looked for:—

"The 1st, That at a certain day appointed for my going abroad on horseback on the moors, between this

and Stafford, where ordinarily, you know, but few people do pass, let fifty or threescore horsemen, well mounted and armed, come to take me away, as they may easily, my keeper having with him but eighteen or twenty horse, armed only with pistols.[1]

"The 2d means. To come at midnight, or soon after, and set fire to the barns and stables, which you know are near to the house; and whilst my guardian's servants shall come forth to the fire, your company having duly on a mark whereby they may be known one from another, some of you may surprise the house, where I hope, with the few servants I have about me, I shall be able to give you correspondent aid.

"And the 3d is. Some there be shall bring carts hither early in the morning. These carts may be so prepared, that being in the midst of the great gate the carts might fall down or overthrow; that thereupon you might come suddenly, and make yourselves master of the house, and carry me suddenly away: so you might easily do before any number of soldiers, who lodge in sundry places forth of this place, some half a mile and some a whole mile, could come to relieve. Whatsoever issue the matter taketh, I do, and shall, think myself obliged, so long as I live, towards you for the offers you make to hazard yourself as you do for my deliverance; and by any means that ever I may have, I shall do my endeavour to recompense you as you deserve. I have ordered a more complete alphabet to be made for you, which you will herewith

[1] In the State Trials, "with only dogs," i. 1181; in the original French, "pistolles," Labanoff, vi. 393. The translation in the first instance would render this "daggs," a "dagg" being in the sixteenth century the ordinary term for a pistol. From "daggs" to "dogs" the transition is easy.

receive. May the Almighty God protect you. Your assured good friend for ever, MARIE R.

"Fail not to burn this privately and quickly." [1]

Of this letter there are three copies in the Record Office, one in French and two in English; but neither the original nor the copy of the cipher has been preserved. There is, however, a postscript in cipher, bearing on its back, in the handwriting of Philipps, the following words: "The postscript of the Scottish queen's letter to Babington," to which it is necessary to call the attention of the reader.

We learn from Camden that it was suspected at the time that a postscript had been added to Mary's letter in Walsingham's office, for the purpose of implicating her in the plot against Elizabeth.[2] Now, the letter actually produced contained, as we perceive, no postscript; but the postscript to which we refer, and which is indorsed by Philipps, corresponds exactly with that described by Camden. It is to the following effect: "I would be glad to know the names and qualities of the six gentlemen which are to accomplish the designment; for that it may be I shall be able, upon knowledge of the parties, to give you some further advice, necessary to be followed therein; as also, from time to time, particularly how you proceed, and as soon as you may, for the same purpose, who be already and how far every one privy hereunto."

It is further necessary to observe that an alteration has been made in this postscript. After the word

[1] State Trials, i. 1180.

[2] "Quibus subdole additum eodem charactere postscriptum ut nomina sex nobilium ederet, *si non et alia.*"—See original of Camden, ii. 479.

"therein," the following passage was originally inserted, and then blotted out; but it is still legible: "and even so do I wish to be made acquainted with the names of all such principal persons as also who be already, as also who be," &c.

How are we to account for the existence of this mysterious postscript?[1] If it was genuine, why was it not produced? If it was forged, why was it pre-

[1] Mr Froude has attempted to explain the existence of the postscript as follows: There is in the Record Office a letter from Curle to Emilio (Gilbert Gifford) dated the 7th of August; and as Mary and her secretaries followed the new style, then recently introduced by Gregory XIII., this letter would, according to the old style, which was still observed in England, bear date ten days earlier—namely, the 28th of July. In this letter Curle says: "I doubt by your former, which I found some difficulty in deciphering, that myself have erred in setting down the addition which I sent you through some haste I had then in despatching thereof. I pray you forbear using the said addition, until that against the next I put the whole at more leisure in better order," &c.

Mr Froude assumes that the "addition" here spoken of by Curle is the postscript in question, and that, in consequence of Curle's instructions, it was not sent on to Babington.

But Gifford was at this time in London; and assuming that Curle's letter had been sent off as soon as it was written, it could not have reached London in less than two days—that is to say, before the 30th. But Babington received Mary's letter on the 29th; so that the postscript, if sent, must have been delivered before Curle's letter reached Gifford. But as no postscript was ever produced, we may conclude that none was sent.

There is another point to be considered. If the postscript was genuine it would have been in Curle's hand, which it certainly is not. There are in the Record Office numerous ciphered letters of Curle (see Mary Queen of Scots, vols. xvii., xviii., and xix.) They are easily distinguishable, from the singular neatness and beauty of the characters. The ciphers of the postscript are written in a rough careless hand, totally unlike that of Curle; but they bear a strong resemblance to those of Philipps. There is preserved in the Record Office a specimen of the ciphers of Philipps; and although it would be rash to express a positive opinion upon the subject, their resemblance to the ciphers of the postscript is obvious.—See in the Record Office ciphers of the reign of Elizabeth, vol. ii.

For these reasons we conclude that the "addition" referred to by Curle could not be the "postscript" indorsed in the handwriting of Philipps.

served? One thing only seems to be clear, that it is an original paper, and not a copy. It may be said that a mistake of a few words, or of a whole line, might have easily been made by a copyist. But the alteration referred to is not the error of a copyist; it is the deliberate substitution of one passage for another, which the author of the paper could alone have made.

If a conjecture might be hazarded on a matter so dark and dubious, the existence of this suspicious postscript may be accounted for as follows: We know that Philipps sent up to Walsingham on the 19th of July a copy, or a pretended copy, of Mary's letter. If, on deciphering it, he found that it contained no matter implicating her in the plot against Elizabeth, might he not have appended this postscript to it? and may we not thus account for its preservation among the papers of Walsingham? True, it was not produced against the Scottish queen; but may not the forger, upon second thoughts, instead of relying on a postscript merely, have preferred to insert some criminating matter in the body of the letter, which would prove still more clearly her knowledge and approval of the plot? Is it at all improbable that, like Murray's description to De Silva of Mary's letter to Bothwell, this postscript was the first rough draft of the forgery? We know that Mary's letter to Babington remained eleven days in the hands of Philipps and Walsingham. There was, therefore, ample time to alter and amend it; and in the different passages marked in italics, the guilt of Mary is portrayed in colours far more elaborate and distinct than it appears in the discarded postscript.

But the forger had better have adhered to his origi-

nal plan; for we have seen that these murderous passages, which Mary so solemnly declared she never wrote, are flatly contradicted in a subsequent portion of the letter, which, if he had not overlooked, he might easily have expunged.

Mary's letter was dated the 17th of July, and it fell into the hands of Philipps on the following day. On the 19th he sent off a deciphered copy to Walsingham. "You have now," he said, "this queen's answer to Babington, which I received yesternight. If he be in the country, the original will be conveyed into his hands, and like enough an answer returned. I look for your honour's speedy resolution touching his apprehension or otherwise, that I may dispose of myself accordingly. I think, under correction, you have enough of him, unless you would discover more particularities of the confederates, which may be done even in his imprisonment. If your honour mean to take him, ample commission and charge would be given to choice persons for search of his house. It is like enough, for all her commandment, her letter will not soon be defaced. I wish it for an evidence against her, if it please God to inspire her majesty with that heroical courage that were mete for avenge of God's cause, and the security of herself and this State. At least I hope she will hang Nau and Curle," &c.

Considering the extreme importance of Mary's answer, and the eager desire manifested by Philipps to obtain it—attending, as he said, "her very heart"—we cannot but feel surprise at the calm and unimpassioned tone in which he announces to Walsingham the receipt of her anxiously-expected letter. If the version of it afterwards produced by Philipps was genuine, there was

abundant proof of her complicity in the plot against Elizabeth; and we should naturally have expected that he would have expressed, in emphatic terms, his satisfaction that his anticipations had been fulfilled, and congratulated Walsingham that the Scottish queen was at length at his mercy. But, instead of dwelling upon this all-important point, he merely suggests that Babington should be apprehended, and Nau and Curle hanged. As to Mary's letter, he says nothing except that "he wishes it to be used as evidence against her" —and that he might have said if it had not contained a word as to the plot against Elizabeth, for the remaining portion of the letter contained ample proof of her approval, both of the insurrection of the Catholics and of the projected invasion of the Prince of Parma.

Let us now trace the subsequent history of Mary's fatal letter. Babington had informed her that he would be at Litchfield on the 12th of July, but he had not kept his promise. He still lingered in London with his brother-conspirators, who probably by this time began to entertain some suspicion of the spies by whom Walsingham had surrounded them. Philipps was accordingly desired to return to London,[1] and to bring with him Mary's original letter to Babington. On the 26th Philipps arrived in London, but it was not until the 29th that it was delivered to Babington, as he afterwards described, by "a homely serving-man in a blue coat," who, like the "unknown boy," the bearer of Mary's former letter, was an entire stranger to him. Whether the letter thus delivered was the letter of Mary, or an interpolated transcript prepared by Philipps, we have no means of now ascer-

[1] Walsingham to Philipps, July; Record Office.

taining. But when we find a vital link in a chain of evidence supplied at the very time when it is wanted, we naturally regard it with suspicion, and we subject it to the severest tests before we accept it as genuine. And if these precautions are deemed essential at the present time, how much more was that the case in the sixteenth century, when political chicanery had reached its highest or its lowest point? Walsingham, we know, was eager at this time to connect Mary with Babington's plot against the life of Elizabeth. He sends down Philipps to Chartley to obtain the necessary proof, and Philipps returns with all convenient speed, bearing with him the precise evidence that was required. No other proof of Mary's complicity was ever produced except this solitary letter, which remained in the hands of Philipps and of Walsingham no less than eleven days—namely, from the 18th to the 29th of July, and of which an alleged deciphered copy only now exists.

It may be said that the original cipher would be destroyed by Babington; and this is probable enough. But copies in cipher of all the other letters written on the same day by Mary to Charles Paget, Morgan, Mendoza, and others, are still preserved. These letters contain ample proof of her approval of the plan of invasion, as well as of the rising of the Catholics, but they are silent as to the plot against Elizabeth. Can we believe that Philipps made copies of these comparatively unimportant letters, and that he left uncopied the "bloody letter" of Babington, as he himself styled it, and of Mary's equally murderous reply—the two documents, in short, upon which the whole case against the Scottish queen depended? It is at least

a circumstance of very strong suspicion that the ciphers of these two letters alone are missing, while those of all the others are preserved.

It has been said that the authenticity of these two letters was subsequently admitted by Mary's two secretaries, and eventually by Babington himself. This has been stated even by historians favourable to the Scottish queen. But it will be shown, as our narrative proceeds, that this notion has arisen from a misapprehension of the facts, and that no proof exists that these letters were acknowledged either by the secretaries of Mary or by Babington.

Some of my readers may possibly here ask if it is material to inquire whether or not Mary was a party to the conspiracy of Babington. The French ambassador in London, M. de Chateauneuf, said at the time that the Queen of Scots was justified in doing all that was alleged against her to obtain her liberty;[1] and a distinguished modern authority has expressed the same opinion in very decided terms.[2] It might, indeed, be fairly argued, that any individual, whether sovereign or subject, detained in captivity without a shadow of

1 "Car estant née princesse souveraine et détenue prisonniere si long temps contre raison, elle ne peult estre blasmée (quand bien elle auroit faict tout ce dont on la veult charger) si elle a cherché tous les moyens de sa deliverance."—Egerton, 232.

2 "Babington's conspiracy," says Lord Brougham, "included rebellion, and also the assassination of Elizabeth; and great, and certainly very fruitless pains, are taken by Mary's partisans to rebut the proofs of her having joined it. She indeed never pretended to resist the proof that she was a party to the conspiracy in general; she only denied her knowledge of the projected assassination. But supposing her to have been also cognisant of that, it seems not too relaxed a view of duty to hold that one sovereign princess, detained unjustifiably in captivity by another for twenty years, has a right to use even extreme measures of revenge. In self-defence all means are justifiable, and Mary had no other means than war to the knife against her oppressor."

right for nearly twenty years, and subjected in that long interval to every species of mental torture which human malice could devise, would be justified in resorting even to assassination to regain his liberty. But into this nice question of morals it is unnecessary to enter. Mary from first to last declared that she never assented to the assassination scheme; and she either told a deliberate falsehood, or her accusers were guilty of an atrocious forgery. Nothing can be more clear and distinct than the issue thus raised between them, and it is essential to the character of both that the matter should be determined.

Before leaving the subject of these ciphered letters, we have to call the attention of our readers to a curious correspondence which passed between Gifford and Philipps. It would appear that, some time after their plan had been arranged, the fidelity of Gifford began to be suspected by his employers. As he was still in close communication with Mary's friends in France, and spent as much of his time in Paris as in London, the suspicion was not unnatural; and Philipps, half in jest and half in earnest, seems to have written to him on the subject. Gifford was much alarmed.[1] If his treachery to Mary should be discovered in France, he had just cause to dread the vengeance of the Duke of Guise; and he well knew that in England any kind of evidence would suffice to consign a Papist and a priest to the rack and the quartering-knife. He wrote accordingly to Philipps, protesting with many oaths that he was innocent. Being evidently in a state of great excitement and

[1] Gifford's letter is without date; but he was certainly abroad at the time, and apparently in Paris.

alarm, his letter is written in the most familiar and confidential tone, and it throws a very instructive light upon the proceedings in which he and his correspondent were at the time engaged.

GIFFORD TO PHILIPPS.

"I know not which way to turn me, nor how to answer yours; but I perceive the ancient speech will be verified that betwixt both I shall lose both, as commonly men of my coat do that deal and bear sincere affection to our prince. Pardon me if I speak boldly, for, by God, you touch me near; and though I should lose all the friends I have in the world, by God, it is nothing in respect of that wherein most unjustly either you suspect or accuse me, wherein I defy all the world; and, by Jesus Christ, if there be any man alive that accuseth me therein, I will be in England, if I die a thousand times, either to purge myself before the world, or to die ignominiously therefore; and if you were my friend a thousand times, let us not jest in such matters: and methinks if you consider all circumstances, either you must condemn me as the veriest ass that ever was, or else you can find no fault in me; for how would I have delivered their letters, knowing that they wrote everything to the Queen of Scots, or how chance they named not me in their letters? By Jesus, I wonder how you can conceive any such matter. But this is the truth, as you and I and we all shall one day be judged in the light of the whole world. It is true, I always feared lest matters should be revealed, and I confess your understanding and experience in these points to be good: but yet I will never yield to deal with those men better than myself; and I am assured

it had been discovered if I had not dealt in such order. Therefore, when Morgan examined me secretly touching the parties that conveyed letters, I was forced to name two, whereof Barnes [1] was one: and for that purpose I dealt with Barnes, never thinking, as Jesus Christ save me, but to make him a colour for Emilio; [2] and his writing once or twice would cause all blame to be removed from myself when things should be opened, which I knew must needs be shortly; and so in truth it is fallen forth, and otherwise it is impossible to have continued. But as God is my witness, I thought to have withdrawn him after that Morgan had fully perceived that the convoy was sure; and one thing I will tell you, if you handle the matter cunningly, Barnes may be the man to set up the convoy again, for Paget and Morgan be never in rest inquiring for him. I have feigned as though the matter is irrecuperable, and therefore I have speculated upon the point. If you have Barnes, keep him close; if you have him not, I would you had him in your hands. Howsoever it be, either bring him by promise or fear to write to Morgan; or if you have him not, *feign his hand to me.* His name was Pietro Maria. *Write by the name of Pietro Maria, discoursing of the whole success;* and that as chance was, your name never came in question, and that now is time to begin again, which they desire

[1] The account we have of Barnes from one of the conspirators is as follows: "There is one Thomas Barnes, a Warwickshire man, that Gilbert Gifford left in his abode to take such letters as came to the French ambassador's hands for the Queen of Scots, and carry them to the said brewer to be delivered to the queen, and to stay for the queen's answer, which was transported by the ambassador's means."—Confession of John Savage; Record Office, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. xix. It is obvious from Gifford's letter that Barnes was not in the secret of Gifford's treachery.

[2] One of Gifford's own names.

beyond measure; and no doubt they *will take hold of it*, for they are about another practice, I assure you: and I pray you be Emilio no more. Let him be one of them that were hanged, for, before God, they will suspect. *After you have written to me, they will leap for joy.* I cannot devise any better course."

Another passage of this remarkable letter is equally significant:—

"Gratley is gone into Germany. Paget feareth nothing now; but assure yourself he will not come into England without great broils, and that he reckoneth of: therefore take some other course. I know no other course *but to feign a letter from some of his friends, as from Ned Windsor*,[1] for desiring him to meet him in some place most convenient for the feat either to conduct him into England, or deal otherwise as his good services towards her majesty deserveth." He adds: "Paget, Morgan, and Gratley write to me every day. I know that D. Gifford[2] would easily be brought to the ——.[3] But he is nothing in respect of Paget, whose taking would be hindered. I will play the plot as though I be absent from Paris. There shall not a tittle escape me."

Some of the allusions of Gifford it is impossible now to explain, but there are others which clearly explain themselves. In order to deceive Mary's friends in Paris, he desires Philipps to forge a letter from Barnes, at the sight of which, he says, "they will leap for joy." He further desires him to forge a letter from Edward Windsor to Charles Paget, apparently for the

[1] A brother of Lord Windsor, and a friend of Babington.
[2] He alludes to his uncle Dr Gifford.
[3] Illegible in the MS.

purpose of luring Paget to England, where he might be apprehended. The undisguised and unambiguous terms in which these directions are given are especially worthy of notice. Gifford does not speak of the forging as of some new untried experiment; he treats it as a thing with which both he and his correspondent were perfectly familiar. Now we know for certain that for four or five months the whole of the correspondence of the Queen of Scots passed through the hands of these two men. Can we believe that, when they could discourse thus deliberately of forging, they would have hesitated to tamper with a letter? Is not the presumption strong that, finding nothing in her correspondence that would render her amenable to the recent statute, Philipps at length repaired to Chartley "to attend her very heart," as he himself expressed it, and speedily returned to place in Walsingham's hands Babington's interpolated letter and Mary's interpolated answer? And is not the presumption immensely strengthened when we find that upon these two letters the truth or falsehood of the charge entirely depends?

There is only one other passage in Gifford's letter to which we shall refer. It is as follows: "In truth, I must needs confess I had an inkling of something; but, by Jesus, I neither know the matter nor persons—only I know they had an enterprise, and so much I told Secretary Walsingham; and the greatest cause of my going away was that *I feared to be brought to witness some matters concerning the Scottish queen face to face.*"[1] We cannot but commend the prudence of

[1] Gifford to Philipps, deciphered in the handwriting of Philipps; Record Office, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. xx.

the spy who, under the circumstances, shrank from confronting the Queen of Scots.

So much for Gilbert Gifford. Let us now turn to his accomplice Philipps. It would be obviously unfair to conclude that he was a practised forger merely from the fact that Gifford asked him to fabricate two letters. But we have abundant proof from other sources that Philipps possessed extraordinary skill in the art—for such in this age it was considered—of forgery. There is in the Cotton Library a confession of one Thomas Harrison, styling himself secretary to Sir Francis Walsingham, who states that Philipps could imitate exactly almost any handwriting;[1] and of this statement we have an absolute confirmation from Philipps himself. He was at this time, from Mary's description of him, but a young man; but twenty years later —namely, in the year 1606—we find him confessing to the then Earl of Salisbury that, during the previous reign, he had carried on with some base object an entirely fictitious correspondence. He wrote letters from an imaginary person in this country to a real person abroad,[2] and thus drew from him certain information,

[1] Caligula, ix. 458.

[2] It appears that the king had expressed great displeasure on the discovery of Philipps's proceedings, and he addressed Lord Salisbury as follows:—

"Philipps humbly prayeth that the king's majesty may be moved to descend into a gracious consideration of his case, and he doubteth not but his majesty shall find cause to conceive much better of his proceedings than it seemeth he doth.

"The truth is, there never was any real or direct correspondence held with Owen. But by a mere stratagem and sleight in the late queen's time, that state upon an occasion, was entertained in an opinion of an intelligence with an imaginary person on this side, such as was none *in rerum naturâ*, which Owen, abused, did manage on that side, as Philipps for the queen's service did on this. The manner whereof and

which was desired, as he alleged, for State purposes. Are we not, therefore, entitled to assume, that in a matter of such vast importance as that upon which he was now engaged he would not scruple to exert himself to the utmost of his skill? Can we doubt that some spurious writing was enclosed in the packet which Paulet returned to Philipps on the 29th of June with the significant message that he dared not proceed to the execution of his plan?

Such was the character, and such the practices, of Gifford and Philipps, the two men employed by Walsingham to bring the Queen of Scots to the scaffold. Having now obtained evidence sufficient for his purpose, the secretary determined to act. Ballard, who passed by the name of Captain Fortescue, and always appeared in public in a military costume of the newest fashion, was first arrested.[1] He was no doubt regarded by Walsingham as the ringleader of the conspiracy; and having been taken in Babington's lodgings, that infatuated youth now took an extraordinary step. He sought an interview with Walsingham, and

the means were particularly declared to my Lord of Salisbury by Philipps when he was first called in question, who had himself made some use of it in the queen's time; and you, Mr Lieutenant, can, best of any man, remember how the queen and my Lord of Essex served themselves of it.

"In the carriage of this business, the imaginary correspondent being pressed to find somebody that should set afoot certain overtures, touching peace, and the jewels of the house of Burgundy, and suchlike, Philipps was nominated and used for those purposes, to the contentment of both sides, as it fell out at sundry times, without that it was known, or so much as suspected, that Philipps was the man that *indeed managed all matters*."—Quoted from the State Paper Office, 29th April 1606, by Tytler, vol. viii., Appendix, 14.

[1] On the 4th of August. "Being a Popish priest, he came in a grey cloak laid on with gold lace, in velvet hose, a cut sattin doublet, a fair hat of the newest fashion, the band being set with silver buttons," &c.—Speech of the Solicitor-General Egerton; Howell, i. 1150.

offered him his services. He even proposed to repair to France, with the view, as he pretended, of watching the partisans of the Queen of Scots; and the secretary listened to his offers with seeming approbation. But he privately instructed one of his satellites to keep a constant watch upon him. Being in a tavern with this man, Babington accidentally discovered his true occupation, and, giving him the slip,[1] hastened to the lodgings of his friend Gage, in Westminster. They were there joined by Barnwell, Charnock, and Donne; and after a hurried consultation, they all disguised themselves as they best could, and, under cover of night, made their way to Saint John's Wood, which was then, as its name implies, a piece of partially reclaimed forest. They here contrived to subsist for several days; but warrants having been issued for their apprehension, they were all taken in the neighbourhood of Harrow, where it was discovered that a farmer named Bellamy had supplied them with food and shelter, and who subsequently paid the penalty of his humanity with his life.

Babington and his four companions were forthwith conveyed to London and lodged in prison, amid the ringing of bells and the shouts and execrations of the populace, who had been roused to fury by a variety of rumours, carefully circulated by the Government for the purpose. It was given out that the Papists intended both to murder the queen and burn the city; that in some counties they had already risen; and that a French and Spanish army was on its way to England.[2] Walsingham, meanwhile, had not lost sight of the other

[1] "He rose from the board as it were to pay the shot, leaving his cloak and sword behind him, and ran hastily by dark to Westminster, where Gage changed clothes with him," &c.—Camden, 307.

[2] Chateauneuf, August 24; Egerton, 74.

conspirators. Salisbury, Travers, and Jones having been provided with horses by their friends, fled northwards; but being hotly pursued, the two former were overtaken in Cheshire and the latter in Wales. Abington contrived to reach Worcestershire, his native county, but was there arrested hiding in a hay-loft. Titchbourne, Savage, and Tilney were surprised and taken in London before they could devise any means of escape. Edward Windsor alone of all the conspirators managed to evade the vigilance of Walsingham, and made his way to France.

All the prisoners were forthwith subjected to the most rigorous examination; but nothing material seems to have been extracted from any of them, except from Savage. His confession, in the handwriting of Philipps, is still extant; and, like the letter of Parry to the queen, it is chiefly remarkable for certain details which it contains, and which were subsequently suppressed. Why Elizabeth's ministers suppressed these passages is obvious. They directly charged Walsingham's agent, Gilbert Gifford, as an accessory to the plot.

"The first thing," said Savage, "which I did know or discover, was that Doctor Gifford, priest and reader of Divinity in the English seminary at Rheims, did solicit me to have slain the queen's majesty, or the Earl of Leicester, which act he affirmeth to be of great merit, and the only means to reform the State, and a thing approved by Doctor Allen, as he gave me to understand, *since my coming to England* by *Gilbert Gifford*, late reader of Philosophy in the same seminary."[1]

[1] Confession of Savage in the handwriting of Philipps; Record Office, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. xix.

It was after the arrival of Savage in England, therefore, that Gilbert Gifford instigated him to proceed with the plot, assuring him, by way of incentive, that it was approved by Doctor Allen, the head of the Catholic seminary at Rheims. Beyond this absolutely worthless testimony, we have no proof that Allen ever expressed any such approval.

"It was likewise said by Gilbert Gifford," continued Savage, "that the Pope did levy great numbers of men in Italy, which colourably marched to serve the Prince of Parma, but were to join with either French or Spaniards to enter into this land." And again: "Touching the intended invasion of the Spanish and French aforesaid, it is of certainty, *as well by the speeches of Gilbert Gifford with me*, as also by the letters of Morgan, that the French would not attempt to invade before such time as either the Catholics had taken her majesty now reigning, or else might be most certainly assured could be safely delivered out of the hands of Sir Amias Paulet."

These confessions of Savage, so carefully suppressed by Walsingham and his colleagues,[1] afford strong confirmation of the statement of the French ambassador that the real contriver of the plot was Gilbert Gifford.

Titchbourne, another of the conspirators, declared on his examination that he was opposed to the plan of invasion, "which he would resist, knowing the miseries of conquest," and that he knew nothing of the murder. He further said that Babington told him he had been persuaded by Ballard, a man of great judgment. This further confirms the narrative of the

[1] In the confession of Savage published in the State Trials, these conversations with Gilbert Gifford are suppressed (i. 1130).

French ambassador, who says that Gifford brought Ballard from France expressly for the purpose of overcoming the scruples of Babington. In consequence of these disclosures, Ballard was racked without mercy, but nothing material appears to have been extorted from him, in spite of the ingenuity of his tormentors.

Many consultations were meanwhile held respecting the disposal of the Queen of Scots; and it was finally determined that her two secretaries should be arrested and brought to London, and that her papers and correspondence should be seized while she was still in ignorance of the fate of Babington and his companions. William Wade, a sworn enemy of the Scottish queen, was sent down to Staffordshire to take the necessary steps; and to keep all knowledge of his visit from the inmates of Chartley, he arranged a meeting with Sir Amias Paulet at some distance from the castle, where they speedily decided on their plan of operations.

Mary's health had improved at Chartley. She was now able to take exercise on horseback; and a day or two after his interview with Wade, Paulet proposed that she should ride with him to Tixall, a house of Sir Walter Aston, some few miles distant, to see a buck-hunt.[1] Suspecting nothing, but surprised perhaps at the unwonted courtesy of her host, Mary readily complied. She was accompanied, probably at the suggestion of Paulet, by both her secretaries, and by various of her attendants. As they approached the gate of Tixall Park, a party of horsemen seemed to be awaiting their arrival; and Mary's heart must have bounded at the thought that at length her friends had come for

[1] On the 8th of August.—Memorial of Paulet; Record Office.

her deliverance. But her keeper eyed the strangers with an unruffled countenance; and the mystery was soon explained by their leader riding forward with a royal warrant for the immediate removal of the Scottish queen to Tixall, and the conveyance of her secretaries to London.

That Mary was indignant at the trick which had been played upon her, and that she addressed some sharp words to Paulet, we can well understand. That she called upon her attendants to draw their swords in her defence we cannot believe,[1] for she must have seen that resistance was hopeless. After witnessing the departure of her secretaries, whom she never saw again, she was hurried on to Tixall without an attendant or a change of dress, and was there kept in close confinement for seventeen days.[2] From this time forward till the day of her death we know nothing of Mary Stewart except what her enemies have chosen to tell; and how she passed this dreary time at Tixall they have not informed us.

As soon as Mary and her secretaries were disposed of, Paulet and Wade hastened back to Chartley. Her repositories were forthwith broken open and examined with the utmost care. Every letter and every scrap of writing was carefully packed up and sent to Windsor for the perusal of Elizabeth.[3] After a clean sweep had been made of everything upon which Wade and Paulet desired to lay their hands, her keeper was ordered to bring her back to Chartley.

[1] Mr Froude states this on the authority of a letter from D'Esneval, (xii. 257); but D'Esneval was in Scotland at the time.

[2] From the 8th till the 25th of August, when she was brought back to Chartley.

[3] N. Yettswert to Walsingham, 19th August; Record Office.

On leaving Tixall, a crowd of beggars, attracted no doubt by the fame of her bounty, had assembled at the gates of the park. "I have nothing for you," she said, addressing them; "I am a beggar as well as you—all is taken from me."[1]

On her arrival at Chartley, she found that during her absence Curle's wife had given birth to a daughter. The news of her husband's arrest, and the scenes which followed, had brought on her confinement prematurely; and Mary, never unmindful in the midst of her own distresses of the sufferings of others, hastened to her bedside before proceeding to her own apartments. She there, according to Paulet, told her "to be of good comfort, and that she would answer for her husband in all things that might be objected against him." It appears that for some time past, probably before she was removed from the custody of Lord Shrewsbury, an ecclesiastic, who passed by the name of her almoner, had been allowed to attend her; but, as he had now been removed, she requested Paulet to allow his chaplain to baptise the child which had been born beneath his roof. As the mother was a Protestant, she could have had no objection. But true to his churlish nature, Paulet flatly refused this most reasonable request; and the contrast between the miserable bigotry of the Puritan knight and the tolerant spirit of the Papist queen is alike striking and instructive.[2] Accustomed by this time to the temper of her keeper, Mary was in no ways discomposed, but, placing the

[1] Paulet to Walsingham, 27th August; Record Office.

[2] Mr Froude, seeking to justify Paulet, says he refused to allow his chaplain to christen the child when Mary said "it was to bear her own name" (xii. 259). This would make Paulet's conduct still more inexcusable.

infant on her knee, baptised it in his presence by her own name of Mary — a proceeding at which Paulet stood aghast with pious horror. But he charitably added, on reflection, that as she had committed every other crime, he ought not to have been surprised.[1]

On proceeding to her apartments she found that her repositories and drawers had been ransacked, and that her papers and correspondence of every kind had been carried off. Did she display anything like conscious guilt on discovering that all her secrets were in the hands of her enemies? If she had been carrying on, as they alleged, a murderous correspondence with Babington, and all had come to light, she could not, even although she had been the most consummate impostor in the world, have failed to show some symptoms of uneasiness. But on witnessing the outrage which had been committed in her absence, she expressed herself, not in alarm, but in honest indignation. Turning to Paulet from the scene before her, she said there were two things of which he could not deprive her, her royal blood and her religion, "which both she would keep until her death."

Some days after this occurrence Paulet received orders to take possession of all her money. She was confined to her bed at the time, and unable, Paulet informs us, to move her hand. But, accompanied by a magistrate of the district, he entered her apartment, and after explaining his errand, demanded her keys. Paulet says that she at first refused to give them up, and used very bitter words, both against himself and Lord Burghley.[2] We must

[1] Paulet to Walsingham, 27th August; Record Office.
[2] See Ellis, iii. 9; Paulet to Burghley.

regret that Paulet has not repeated them; for even in her anger Mary never forgot her rank or sex, and the epithets she applied to her keeper and the lord treasurer were no doubt aptly chosen. He replied, in his own gruff way, that if she did not give up the keys he would break open the drawers forthwith. To this threat she yielded, and Paulet at once took possession, not only of the whole of her money, but also of that belonging to her secretaries. Of French money she had at this time 5000 crowns, and of English £114 in gold and £3 in silver. Paulet generously left her the latter sum to pay the wages of her servants.

Her secretaries were possessed of a still larger sum. In the repositories of Nau, who belonged to a family of some distinction in France,[1] were found three bags containing upwards of £1400 in gold, and a gold chain worth £100. The money belonging to Curle amounted, according to Paulet, exactly to 2000 crowns, which he said was the queen's marriage-gift to him and his wife. But Wade had reported, on the occasion of the first search, that there were three canvas bags, each containing 1000 crowns; and if Wade was correct, one of them had disappeared in the interval.

Of these different sums Paulet kept £500 of Nau's money for the use of the household.[2] What became of the remainder we do not know.

Her two secretaries had meanwhile been carried up to London, where they were kept close prisoners in Walsingham's house; and it was now his business to induce them to accuse their mistress. It was necessary for his purpose to prove that she either wrote, or

[1] He was the brother of the Seigneur de Fontenay.

[2] Paulet to Burghley, *ubi supra*.

caused to be written, the fatal letter to Babington; and to this fact her two secretaries could alone depose. The mode in which she carried on her English correspondence was, according to the testimony of Nau, as follows: She either composed with her own hand in French, or dictated to Nau in the same language, the minutes or heads of the letter she desired to write. It was then written out by Nau, and examined and corrected by herself; and it was finally translated into English and put into ciphers by Curle. Both were therefore able to speak as to the identity of the letter which Mary is said to have addressed to Babington, and of which an alleged copy, deciphered by Philipps, was in the hands of Walsingham.

The secretaries at first would say nothing to criminate their mistress; but it is said that they were eventually induced, by promises or threats, to make various statements admitting that she had caused them to write the fatal letter to Babington. As to the true nature of these confessions we have no certain knowledge, for the originals have disappeared; and it would be preposterous, knowing as we do the practices of Walsingham and his subordinates, to place any reliance on the so-called copies of these documents which now exist. Even if genuine, the confessions of men made in dread of torture and death would have little weight. In their present shape they are absolutely worthless.[1]

[1] Mr Froude, on the subject of the documents still preserved relative to Mary's complicity with Babington, expresses himself as follows: "Every document of consequence was submitted to a committee, of which two peers were members who had been hitherto the keenest advocates of her claims—Shrewsbury, in whom she had herself the most perfect confidence, and Cobham, who had more than once been implicated

Some points respecting the examination of the two secretaries are, however, worthy of note.

On the 4th of September, up to which time it is not alleged that they had said anything to criminate their

in conspiracies in her favour. *Every deciphered letter in the vast collection bears endorsed upon it the signatures of Shrewsbury and Cobham, besides those of Burghley and Walsingham and Sir Francis Knollys.* The cipher keys themselves bear signs of no less scrupulous examination. The most exaggerated precautions were thought necessary against suspicion of unfair dealing."—Vol. xii. 258. In this extraordinary passage Mr Froude has surpassed himself. The documents to which he refers are contained in two volumes of State papers in the Record Office, entitled Mary Queen of Scots, vols. xviii. and xix. I have carefully examined them all, and I find only one solitary paper attested in the manner Mr Froude describes, and bearing the signatures of Burghley, Shrewsbury, Hunsdon, Cobham, and Walsingham. But the document upon which these names appear is neither original nor important. It is a deciphered copy, in the handwriting of Philipps, of a letter from Morgan to the Queen of Scots, dated the 9th of July. It is printed in Murdin, p. 528; and on referring to it, the reader will find that it contains no allusion to the Babington conspiracy.

This is the only deciphered letter in the whole collection which bears an original attestation. There is at the end of the deciphered French copy of Mary's letter to Babington an attestation by Babington himself, as well as by Mary's secretaries. But this important document is not attested by any of Elizabeth's ministers. It is wholly in the handwriting of Philipps, and the following is a copy of the attestations:—

C'est la copie des lettres de la royne d'Escosse dernièrement à moy envoyées.

Ainsi signé,
ANTHONIE BABINGTON.

Je pense de vray que l'est la lettre escript par sa majesté à Babington comme il me souvenir.

6th Sept. 1586.
Ainsi signé, NAU.

Telle ou semblable me semble avoir esté la response escript en Francoys par M. Nau laquelle j'ay produit et mis en chiffre comme j'en fais mention au pied d'une copie de la lettre de M. Babington laquelle M. Nau a signé le premier.

Ainsi signé,
GILBERT CURLE.
5th Sept. 1586.

mistress, Burghley—chuckling nevertheless over her approaching fate, of which he now felt assured—suggested, in a note to the Vice-Chamberlain Sir Christopher Hatton, that the two secretaries might be induced "to yield in writing somewhat to confirm their mistress' crime, if they were persuaded that themselves might escape and the blow fall upon their mistress, *betwixt her head and her shoulders.*"[1] The old lord treasurer was unusually jocular on the occasion. He was evidently confident that the blood for which he had thirsted for more than twenty years was about to be shed at last.

We may probably conclude from this letter that some kind of promises were held out to the two secretaries to induce them to accuse their mistress; but before it was written Nau had made a most important statement. It was to the effect that the minute of the letter to Babington was in Mary's own hand, that it was among the papers seized at Chartley, and was then in the hands of Walsingham.[2] The production of this paper, therefore, would have settled at once the question of Mary's innocence or guilt.

But it never was produced. On the day following the date of Nau's statement, Walsingham informed Philipps that it could not be found.[3] He did not question the truth of Nau's statement; and, in fact,

[1] Burghley to Hatton, September 4; from Mr Leigh's Collection in British Museum.

[2] Il luy pleust me bailler une minute de lettre *escripte de sa main* pour la polir et mettre au net, ainsi qu'il apparoit à vos honneurs avoir esté faict ayant *l'une et l'autre entre vos mains.*"—Statement of Nau of 3d September 1586.

[3] "The minute of her answer is not extant."—Walsingham to Philipps, 4th September; Record Office.

Nau had no motive for asserting that the minutes in question were in existence if he knew they had been destroyed. But Walsingham had a very strong motive for destroying them, if they had been discovered and were found to contain nothing implicating the Scottish queen in the plot against Elizabeth. We have already seen how unhesitatingly he and his colleagues could suppress any piece of evidence which they deemed it inconvenient to produce.

In a long memorial subsequently addressed to Elizabeth by Nau on the 10th of September, he declared in the most solemn manner that Mary was induced to write to Babington in consequence of the note she had received from Morgan, and that the long letter of Babington was the first intimation she had received of the conspiracy.[1] He added that, in replying to his letter, she thought it best to take no notice of the design against Elizabeth, although, under the circumstances, she did not consider herself bound to reveal it. In proof of the truth of this statement he again referred to the minutes of her letter to Babington, which would be found among the papers seized at Chartley. This memorial bears on the face of it a strong appearance of probability; but because it exculpated Mary on the essential point in dispute, Burghley, with his accustomed impartiality, indorsed it with his own hand "Long statement of Nau of things of no importance."

In confirmation of the statements of Nau, Mary, when before her judges at Fotheringay, appealed to

[1] "Il est très véritable que Babington luy escrivit la dite longue lettre comme tout un nouveau subject dont elle n'avoit onques ouy parler."—Mémoire de Nau; Labanoff, vii. 208. "La lettre de Morgan et sa minutte pour Babington doivent estre parmy les papiers du dit Curle."—Ibid., 209.

her own notes or minutes in proof of her innocence of any design against the person of Elizabeth,[1] and demanded that they should be produced. And she did this in entire ignorance of the declarations of her secretary, with whom she never had any communication, direct or indirect, after his arrest.

Walsingham and his creatures still searched, or pretended to search, for the missing minutes of the fatal letter; and it was at length given out, on the alleged authority of Curle, that he had burnt them by command of his mistress. But this story was not told at Fotheringay in presence of the Scottish queen. It was told behind her back in the Star Chamber at Westminster, where there was no possibility of contradiction.[2] At Fotheringay she repeatedly called on her accusers to produce her notes, and they never once ventured in her presence to assert that she had ordered them to be destroyed.

During these investigations Elizabeth seems to have been in a state of unusual excitement and alarm, and she became more unmanageable as the time approached for the trial of Babington and his accomplices. She even pretended that she wrote a confidential letter about this time to the Queen of Scots, in which she assured her that, if she would make a full confession[3] of the practices in which she had been engaged, all

[1] State Trials, i. 1183.

[2] Hardwick Papers, i. 250.

[3] See her speech to the Parliament of 1586 (Camden, 325), in which she spoke as follows: "So far from bearing her (Mary) any ill-will, that upon the discovery of certain treasonable practices against me, I wrote unto her secretly that, if she would confess them by a private letter unto myself, they should be wrapped up in silence. Neither did I write thus in mind to entrap her, for I knew then as much as she could confess," &c.

should be forgotten and forgiven. But Elizabeth so rarely told the truth, even when it was her interest to do so, that no reliance can be placed upon her unsupported statement, the more especially as she added that Mary took no notice of her letter. The story, indeed, is altogether incredible. Mary, we know, was the most punctual of correspondents; and it is certain that she never left any former letter of Elizabeth unanswered, although Elizabeth very frequently failed to reply to her. It is quite possible that, agitated as she was by contending passions, she may have entertained the notion of writing to Mary at this time; but if she had actually written and sent off such a letter as she described, it would certainly have drawn from Mary an answer of some kind, although probably not such a one as her rival was eager to obtain.

A special commission had been issued for the trial of Babington and his accomplices; and on the day before their arraignment, a letter was addressed by Burghley to the Vice-Chamberlain Sir Christopher Hatton, which described in very striking terms the state of agitation and alarm of their mistress. She had suddenly[1] become impressed with the belief that her own life would be placed in jeopardy if anything came out at the trial which implicated the Scottish queen. It might lead to some desperate attempt on the part of her friends, who were still numerous in

[1] "Her majesty suddenly here falleth into an opinion that if anything should to-morrow be given in evidence against the Scottish queen whereby it might be thought that she should be criminally touched for her life, it might be perilous to her majesty's person now presently before anything should be executed upon that queen," &c.—Burghley to Hatton, 12th September 1586; from Papers of Mr Leigh, now in the British Museum.

London; and therefore all unnecessary provocation was to be avoided. It was no doubt in consequence of these instructions to Hatton, who was on the special commission, that on the trial of Babington and his friends no reference was made to the alleged complicity of the Queen of Scots in their crimes.

The letter of Burghley to Hatton contained another passage of a still more remarkable kind respecting the duty of the judges at the forthcoming trial. "She commanded me to write," said the lord treasurer, "that when the judges should give their judgment for the manner of their death, which she saith must be done according to the usual form, yet in the end of the sentence they may say that such is the form-usual; but yet, considering this manner of horrible treason against her majesty's own person hath not been heard of in this kingdom, it is reason that *the manner of their death for more terror be referred to her majesty and her Council.*"

Elizabeth rightly assumed that the conviction of Babington and his friends was a matter of certainty; but, like Sir Thomas Lucy, she thought the law of treason was too lenient, and ought to be amended. Burghley ventured to differ with her in opinion, and for the following reasons:—

"I told her majesty that if the fashion of the execution shall be duly and orderly executed by *protracting of the same both to the extremity of the pains in the action*, and in the sight of the people to behold it, the manner of their death would be as terrible as any other new device could be; but therewith her majesty *was not satisfied*, but commanded thus to write to

you, to declare it to the judges and others of the Council."[1]

We have here an edifying picture: the great Protestant queen seeking to devise some kind of punishment, more horrible still than the law allowed, to be inflicted on certain of her subjects who had not as yet been even put upon their trial; and her great minister seeking to console her with the assurance that if due care were taken to protract the agony of the sufferers to the extreme limits of human endurance, the existing mode of punishment was as terrible as any novelty that could be invented,—and yet "her majesty was not satisfied." Her savage Tudor blood was fairly roused. Her thirst of vengeance was as unquenchable as in 1569, after the rising in the north had been suppressed; and she repeated her commands to Burghley to deliver her Draconian message to the judges.

On the 13th of September, Babington and six of his companions—namely, Titchbourne, Salisbury, Barnwell, Savage, Donne, and Ballard—were arraigned at Westminster. It does not appear that any of them had been tortured, excepting Ballard, who had been so severely racked that he was unable to walk, and was carried to the bar in a chair.[2]

On his arraignment Savage pleaded guilty, and his example was followed by all the others. Ballard denied that he had intended to kill the queen, but he admitted that he had "practised the delivery of the

[1] Burghley to Hatton, 12th September 1586; Egerton MSS., British Museum: Papers relating to the Babington conspiracy, from Mr Leigh's Collection.

[2] Letter in Record Office.

Queen of Scots, and went about to alter the religion." On Babington being called upon to plead, he began, in the language of the report, "with a mild countenance, a sober gesture, and a wonderful good grace, to declare the beginnings and proceedings of his treasons."[1] We can hardly doubt that if, as these words imply, he gave a narrative of the plot, he must have alluded to his acquaintance with Gilbert Gifford. But no mention is made of Gifford in the summary of his speech. "In the end," according to the report, "he laid all the blame upon Ballard for bringing him to his destruction."

Barnwell said he never intended harm to the queen, but to the other matters charged he pleaded guilty. Titchbourne at first admitted that he was in the secret of the conspiracy and had not divulged it, but denied that he had committed treason; but he was finally induced to plead guilty. Donne and Salisbury followed his example, although the latter declared that he always protested against the killing of the queen, which he would not do for a kingdom.

We may assume that by this time Burghley or Hatton had succeeded in persuading Elizabeth to allow the law to take its ordinary course; for after all had pleaded, the prisoners were asked one by one in the usual form why they should not be sentenced to die as traitors.

Ballard spoke first, but not one word of his speech has been preserved. It is not unreasonable to suspect that, knowing he was about to die, he may have made

[1] State Trials, vol. i.

charges against Elizabeth's ministers which it was deemed prudent to suppress.[1]

Babington, on his name being called, once more declared that Ballard had instigated him to kill the queen.

"Yea, Mr Babington," said Ballard, "lay all the blame on me; but I wish the shedding of my blood might be the saving of your life. Howbeit, say what you will; I will say no more."[2]

There was an unflinching courage, and even a kind of magnanimity in the reply, which showed the dangerous stuff of which this man was made. He had been racked and tortured until his limbs were powerless, but nothing would induce him to bear witness against his comrades.

Savage and Titchbourne said nothing. Barnwell and Donne said that what they had done was for conscience' sake, and Salisbury besought the queen to pardon his offence. Sir Christopher Hatton then addressed the prisoners in a long speech, expatiating on the enormity of their crime, and denouncing in particular the wickedness of Ballard, an emissary of "those devilish priests and seminaries, against whom he doubted the Parliament had not yet sufficiently provided," and who by his persuasion had brought "to utter destruction a sort of brave youth otherwise endowed with good gifts." All were then sentenced in the usual form to die as traitors.

On the 15th September the remaining seven pri-

[1] The report only says: "Ballard spake something, but not to any effect."—State Trials, i. 1138.

[2] Ibid.

soners were placed at the bar — namely, Abington, Tilney, Jones, Travers, Charnock, Gage, and Bellamy. They all pleaded not guilty, and it must be now admitted that they were all condemned on very insufficient evidence.

To prove the guilt of Abington, certain confessions of Babington were read.[1] To these Abington answered that it was true that Babington had made him privy to his treasons and that he had concealed them; but he added, "When he told me strangers would invade this realm to reform religion, I protested. I had rather be drawn to Tyburn by the heels for my religion than have it reformed by strangers. And for Babington's accusations, what force can it be of? for he, having committed and confessed treason in the most high degree, there was no hope for him but to accuse."

Abington further reminded the judges that, by the statute passed in the 13th year of Elizabeth, it was provided that in all trials for treason at least two witnesses should be produced in open court to prove the charge.

To this very pertinent objection no reply was made, except by the chief-baron (Manwood), who remarked that the prisoner "answered by arguments and not by answers."

[1] He applied to be furnished with writing materials, that he might take notes of the evidence, but his request was refused. The following conversation passed on the subject:—

ABINGTON.—"I beseech your honours I may have a pair of writing-tables, to set down what is alleged against me, that I may yield a sufficient answer thereunto."

THE CLERK OF THE CROWN.—"It was never the course here."

HATTON.—"When you hear anything you are desirous to answer, you shall speak an answer at full, which is better than a pair of tables."—State Trials, i. 1143.

Tilney, who was one of the queen's pensioners, strenuously denied that he had ever assented to the conspiracy, and "that it was no treason to hear treason talked by others." Against Jones there was no evidence at all, except that after Babington's apprehension he had given Salisbury a horse, upon which he fled from London. "My case was hard and lamentable," said Jones, "either to betray my dearest friend, whom I loved as my own self, or else to break my allegiance to my sovereign, and so undo myself and my posterity for ever." Travers had served along with Savage under the Prince of Parma, and fled from London under a feigned name along with Salisbury. "He seemed not to care," says the report, "what evidence came against him, but was resolute to be hanged."

Charnock had also served in the Spanish army in the Netherlands, and had there become acquainted with Savage, for whom he admitted having provided a disguise when he fled from London.

Gage admitted that Ballard had lodged with him, and that they had travelled together in the north; and Bellamy, the farmer at Harrow, confessed that he had given food and shelter to Babington and his companions after their flight from London. "Bellamy," according to the report, "spoke very little for himself; only he seemed to be a very clownish, blunt, wilful, and obstinate Papist." Against all the prisoners a verdict of guilty was returned, and they were all sentenced to death in the usual form.

The execution of Babington was appointed to take place on the 20th September; and on the morning of that day he made a declaration, which is still extant. As this is the only original contemporary confession

relating to the conspiracy which has been preserved, it is important that it should be laid before the reader. The paper upon which it is written contains a variety of ciphers, and on the back are the following words: "I do acknowledge the last of the within written alphabet to be the very same by which I writ unto the Queen of Scots. Anthonie Babington. Acknowledged the 20th day of September 1586."[1]

There is no doubt that this is a genuine paper; and it may be taken as an admission of Babington's guilt, which, in fact, he had already admitted on his trial. But what does it prove against the Queen of Scots? Simply and absolutely nothing. The question is not what he wrote to her, but what she wrote to him. Upon this essential point Babington's confession, as to which there has been much misapprehension, leaves us as much in the dark as ever. Even Dr Lingard, who throughout his History is favourable to the Scottish queen, was under the impression that on the morning of his execution Babington acknowledged as genuine a copy of the fatal letter which he had sent to Mary, and also a copy of her reply.[2] But from the terms of his confession it may be seen that this is an entire mistake. We can well believe that every effort was

[1] Record Office; Domestic series. Babington's subscription is written in a remarkably fine clear hand. The rest of the paper is written in a different hand; but it is attested by the Attorney-General Popham, the Solicitor-General Egerton, Lord Hunsdon, Sir Francis Knollys, and various other persons of note.

[2] He says that Babington, "before his execution, was prevailed upon to acknowledge as true, by his subscription, the copies of his letter to Mary Stewart, and of her answer to him," &c. But of such letters Babington says nothing in his confession. He speaks of the alphabet only.—See the very able note on the subject of the Babington conspiracy; Lingard, vi., Appendix T T.

made before his execution to induce him to make some more definite charge against the Scottish queen; and in the hopes of obtaining some mitigation of the terrible punishment he was about to undergo, he had a powerful motive for disclosing all he knew. Yet nothing was extorted from him but a declaration which, so far as regards her innocence or guilt, is wholly irrelevant.

After signing this paper, Babington, along with Ballard, Savage, Titchbourne, Tilney, Barnwell, and Abington, was carried to St Giles's in the Fields, where they had been accustomed to meet, and which was appointed to be the place of their execution. Ballard first addressed the people, declaring that whatever he had done was for the advancement of the true religion. Babington declared that he had been induced to conspire against the queen, not from any hope of temporal profit, but because he had been persuaded that the action was lawful and meritorious. He was now convinced of his error, and implored her forgiveness, hoping, for the sake of his family, that she would not allow his lands to be forfeited, but permit them to descend to his brother.[1] Savage and Barnwell both declared that zeal for their religion had alone induced them to join in the conspiracy. The longest address was made by Titchbourne, who admitted that Babington had informed him of the plot, but that he had never approved of it, and that regard for his friend had alone induced him to conceal it. "Before this thing chanced," he said, "we lived together in most flourishing estate. Of whom went

[1] The queen gave his estate to a new favourite, Sir Walter Raleigh.—Murdin, 785.

report in the Strand, Fleet Street, and elsewhere about London, but of Babington and Titchbourne? No threshold was of force to brave our entry. Thus we lived, and wanted nothing we could wish for; and God knows what less in my head than matters o State?" He concluded by declaring that he was descended of a house "from two hundred years before the Conquest" never stained with crime, and heartily asked forgiveness of her majesty and all the world.[1]

Tilney made a short speech, declaring that he was a true Catholic, upon which he was interrupted by the Protestant minister, a Dr White, who was present. Tilney replied, "I came hither to die, Doctor, and not to argue." Notwithstanding this just rebuke, the zealous divine proceeded to question Abington as to his religious views. Abington said that he was of that

[1] The following touching lines were composed by Titchbourne the night before his execution :—

"My prime of youth is but a frost of cares,
My feast of joy is but a dish of pain,
My crop of corn is but a field of tares,
And all my goodes is but vain hope of gain.
The day is fled, and yet I saw no sun;
And now I live, and now my life is done!

My spring is past, and yet it hath not sprung;
The fruit is dead, and yet the leaves are green;
My youth is past, and yet I am but young;
I saw the world, and yet I was not seen;
My thread is cut, and yet it is not spun!
And now I live, and now my life is done!

I sought for death, and found it in the wombe;
I lookt for life, and yet it was a shade;
I trade the ground, and knew it was my tombe;
And now I dye, and now I am but made.
The glass is full, and yet my glass is run;
And now I live, and now my life is done!"

—See 'Curiosities of Literature,' by Disraeli, who also prints a farewell letter of Titchbourne to his young wife, ii. 195.

faith which prevailed "in almost all Christendom, excepting here in England;" and desiring to be troubled with no more questions, prepared to meet his fate in the manner prescribed by his own Church. Ballard, as the principal conspirator, was then put to death in the presence of his companions with studied cruelty, and they afterwards all shared his fate. Burghley's advice to his mistress that their sufferings should be carefully protracted was followed to the letter.[1]

Seven of their companions still remained to be executed on the following day; but whether in the interval the queen relented, or whether, as appears more probable, the pity and disgust of the spectators had been excited to a dangerous pitch by the horrid scene, it was not repeated. Salisbury, Donne, Jones, Charnock, Travers, Gage, and Bellamy, were all allowed to hang till they were dead before they were cut to pieces by the executioner. A brother of Bellamy, who was charged like him with giving food and shelter to some of the conspirators after their flight from London, strangled himself in prison before the trial.[2]

It is impossible to regard without sympathy the fate of these unhappy men. If we except Ballard and Savage, they were certainly not of the materials of

[1] "Ballard was first executed. He was cut down and bowelled with great cruelty while he was alive. Babington beheld Ballard's execution without being in the least daunted; whilst the rest turned away their faces, and fell to prayers upon their knees. Babington being taken down from the gallows alive too, and ready to be cut up, he cried aloud several times in Latin, *Porce mihi, Domine Jesu!* Savage broke the rope, and fell down from the gallows, and was presently seized on by the executioner, his privities cut off, and his bowels taken out while he was alive. Barnwell, Titchbourne, Tilney, and Abington were executed with equal cruelty."—Howell, i. 1158.

[2] Ibid., i. 1141.

which conspirators in general are made. Babington and his companions were all young men in affluent, or at least in easy circumstances, and it was by working on his chivalrous feelings that Gifford appears to have induced him to attempt the rescue of the Queen of Scots and the restoration of the ancient faith. His most intimate friends—Titchbourne, Salisbury, and their companions—seem to have given their assent to the scheme more in the spirit of good-fellowship than as political partisans ready to follow an acknowledged leader. No person, in fact, of political note in England was implicated in the plot. The real leader was not Babington, but Ballard—a daring and determined fanatic,[1] who was quite prepared to risk his life in the cause of his religion; and in a less sanguinary age, as no actual violence had been committed, the sacrifice of his life, and perhaps of that of one or two others, might have been deemed sufficient. But, as Walsingham expressed it, the design was "to break the neck of all dangerous practices during her majesty's reign;" and therefore the guilty and the comparatively innocent were all, without distinction, hurried to the scaffold. That Walsingham should have expressed himself in language so significant *before* he was in possession of any evidence against the Queen of Scots, raises the not unreasonable presumption that he knew and approved of the whole of the proceedings of Gilbert Gifford, by whose devilish devices the conspirators

[1] Mendoza, writing to Philip on the subject of the execution, says: "El Balart, que era clerigo, y el que primero executaron, los exorto á todos y animo con que pues havian sido catholices en la vida, lo mostrassen en la muerte."—Teulet, v. 414.

had, step by step, been lured to their destruction. Gifford died, not long afterwards, the inmate of a French prison [1]—a fitting termination of his infamous career.

[1] Camden says he was imprisoned in France for "dishonesty of life," p. 308.

CHAPTER XXV.

FOTHERINGAY.

In the course of this summer and autumn, a correspondence took place between the Catholic nobility of Scotland and the Spanish Government which at one time promised to lead to important results. Letters were addressed to Philip by the Earl of Huntly,[1] Lord Claud Hamilton, and Lord Maxwell,[2] in which they assured him that, with his assistance, they were prepared not only to rescue the young king from the faction by which he was held in thraldom, but to re-establish the Catholic religion in Scotland. They despatched a confidential emissary, named Robert Bruce, to Madrid, to explain in detail their plans to the Spanish king, and they sent Colonel Stewart to Paris to confer on the subject with Mendoza and the Duke of Guise, both of whom expressed their warm approval of the scheme. Mendoza in particular, enthusiastic in the cause of his religion, and implacable in his enmity to Elizabeth, urged Philip, in the

[1] This earl succeeded to the title in 1576.—See Douglas's 'Peerage of Scotland.' His father, as we have seen, had been a Protestant, but he resumed the old religion, which he was now anxious to see restored in Scotland.—See his letter to Philip of 15th May 1586; Teulet, v. 349.

[2] Now created Earl of Morton.—See his letter to Philip of 20th May 1586; Teulet, v. 353.

strongest terms, to embrace the project of the Scottish lords. All they required was a sum of money to secure the services of their friends and retainers, who, they alleged, were fully a match for their opponents. As for the intrigues of Elizabeth, he reminded Philip [1] and the Prince of Parma that in times past the Scots had maintained their independence without losing an inch of territory when England was united, and not split into rival factions as was now the case; and that, moreover, the present opportunity was peculiarly favourable, as, in addition to the notorious disaffection at home, all the available forces in the kingdom were employed in the Netherlands. Philip listened to the arguments of Mendoza with apparent approval; but before coming to any decision on the matter, he referred him to the Prince of Parma, who, like his predecessor Alva, seemed to regard with a considerable amount of misgiving any military enterprise directed against Britain. His reply to Mendoza was not encouraging. He reminded him that the great majority of the people in Scotland were heretics, that the king was little better than a prisoner in their hands, and that they had always been supported more or less actively by the Queen of England. There was another important point to be considered before any final decision could be arrived at—What were the real opinions and intentions of their master the King of Spain? Until these were ascertained, nothing could be done.[2] Upon the whole, Parma recommended that

[1] See his letters to Philip and to the Prince of Parma; Teulet, v. 367, 407. It does not appear that Mary was aware of this movement of the Catholics in Scotland.

[2] Y pues, para poderse resolver bien en este punto y negocio, convernia saber los designos que tiene su magestat en su real pecho, me parece

for the present Mendoza should not commit himself to the Scottish lords, further than by commending their loyalty, and expressing a confident hope that an opportunity would be soon afforded them for its display. It would appear from these remarks that the ministers of Philip were at times quite as much at a loss as those of Elizabeth to ascertain the real intentions of their sovereign.

It had now become necessary to decide on the fate of the Queen of Scots. The evil day which Elizabeth had all along foreseen, and which she could not but regard with doubt and dread, had arrived at last. Guilty or innocent, it mattered not in the political philosophy of the sixteenth century. It was enough that the Scottish queen was a source of constant danger to the State; and with a Spanish invasion no longer looming in the distance, but to all appearance imminent and inevitable, the peril had increased tenfold, and with it the necessity of the sacrifice had become imperative. So reasoned the politicians of that day. Some of the Crown lawyers were even of opinion that she might be tried like any other criminal, by a judge of assize and a Staffordshire jury. But the notion was indignantly scouted by Elizabeth,[1] not from

que no se puede tomar aca otra resolucion, hasta saber esto," &c.—Parma to Mendoza, 21st November 1586; Teulet, v. 431.

[1] "You lawyers," she said, "are so curious in scanning the nice points of the law, and following of precedents and forms, rather than expounding the laws themselves, that by exact observing of your forms she must have been indicted in Staffordshire, and have holden up her hand at the bar, and have been tried by a jury of twelve men—a proper course, forsooth, of trial against a princess! To avoid, therefore, such absurdities, I thought it better to refer the examination of so weighty a cause to a good number of the noblest personages of the land and the judges of the realm; and all little enough. For we princesses are set, as it were, upon stages, in the sight and view of all the world," &c.—See Elizabeth's

regard to her prisoner, but because she considered it derogatory to the royal dignity. The civilians were next set to work, and much antiquarian rubbish was raked up, in the hope that some authority might be found to prove that princes might be lawfully put to death. It was true that no precedent for any such act could be found in the annals of Britain or of France; but certain examples of ancient and medieval history were confidently relied upon by the doctors of the civil law as authorities in point. It must be admitted that at the present day it is impossible to see their application.[1]

speech to the Houses of Parliament in Camden; and State Trials, i. 1194.

[1] There were four examples relied upon by the civilians—*i.e.*, those of Dejotarus, Licinius, Conradin, and Joanna of Naples. The first of these was king or tetrarch of Galatia, a tributary of the Romans, who took the part of Pompey in the war with Cæsar. After the defeat of his rival, Cæsar deprived Dejotarus of the greater portion of his dominions, but, with his accustomed clemency, spared his life.—See Lemprière, and authorities there cited.

Licinius was the brother-in-law of Constantine the Great; and the description of his death, as related by Gibbon, might almost have been written word for word regarding that of the Queen of Scots. "*According to the rules of tyranny*," says the first of English historians, "he was accused of forming a conspiracy, and of holding a treasonable correspondence with the barbarians; but as he was never convicted, either by his own conduct or by any legal evidence, we may perhaps be allowed from his weakness to presume his innocence."—Gibbon's Decline and Fall, A.D. 324.

Conradin was the grandson of the Emperor Frederick II., who had been deprived of his kingdom of Naples by Pope Urban VII. In an attempt to recover the crown of his ancestors, Conradin was in 1268 defeated and taken prisoner by Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX., to whom the Pope had granted the kingdom. By a barbarous exercise of the rights of war as understood in the thirteenth century, Conradin, although not eighteen years old, was publicly executed at Naples by orders of his conqueror.—See Mezeray, Hist. de France.

Between Joanna of Naples and the Queen of Scots the only point of resemblance was, that each had been accused of the murder of her husband. But the charge now made against Mary was not that she had

It was finally resolved, after many anxious consultations, that Mary should be brought to trial under the statute of the preceding year, which had been passed with the express object of giving Elizabeth the necessary jurisdiction. A royal commission was accordingly issued to the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Treasurer, and a number of the chief nobility, to inquire into all offences, "tending to the hurt" of the Queen of England, committed since the 1st. of June by "Mary, daughter and heir of James V., King of Scots, and commonly called Queen of Scots, and Dowager of France, pretending title to the crown of this realm of England." Whether she should be lodged in the Tower, like other State prisoners, was the question next discussed; but as she had many partisans in London, it was finally decided that she should be brought to trial at the castle of Fotheringay, a place of great strength, in Northamptonshire. She had been removed, for greater security, to this the last of her English prisons on the 25th of September.

The French Government was duly apprised by M. de Chateauneuf of the imminent peril in which the Scottish queen now stood, and he urged the king in the strongest terms to interfere in her behalf. Henry and his mother not only remained deaf to his entreaties, but left him without instructions of any kind. Chateauneuf, notwithstanding, addressed a letter to Elizabeth on his own responsibility, in which he ventured to remind her of the many wrongs and sufferings of the Queen of Scots during her long im-

killed her husband, but that she had sought to kill Elizabeth.—See Record Office, Mary Queen of Scots, vol. xx.; and Strype's Annals, vol. iii., Appendix.

prisonment in England, and earnestly requested that, as she was about to be arraigned on a charge affecting her life, she should be allowed an advocate to assist in preparing her defence; that this was the more necessary as she was not only a sovereign princess, but was wholly unacquainted with the laws of England, and that he was not aware that in any country in the world such a privilege would be refused to a stranger, even of inferior rank, who was accused of a capital crime.[1] To this spirited remonstrance Elizabeth replied, through Lord Hunsdon, that she had carefully considered, with the assistance of her Council, what was necessary and just, and that she required no advice from foreign sources; that the Queen of Scots, although a sovereign by birth, having conspired in England against the State, was amenable to the laws of England; and that those who are charged with such crimes are universally deemed to have forfeited all right to the aid of counsel.[2] In his confidential letters, Chateauneuf complained bitterly of the apathetic conduct of his master, and remarked that his influence at the Court of Elizabeth was not now equal to that of the young King of Scots.

Every effort had in the mean time been made to conciliate James, and to convince him of the justice and necessity of the proceedings about to be taken against his mother. Randolph was once more sent to Scotland, not on this occasion with a present of horses or hounds, but with certain experienced "hunting men,"[3] whose services in the Falkland woods it was

[1] See his letter in Cheruel, 150. It is dated Oct. 7. [2] Ibid., 151.

[3] "I have sent the king two hunting men, very good and skilful, with one footman that can hoop, hollow, and cry, that all the trees in Falk-

thought the young monarch would duly appreciate. The Master of Gray was at the same time instructed to sound him on the subject of the approaching trial. But James, though essentially mean and selfish, was not wholly devoid of feeling; and Gray found him so intractable when he touched upon the question of his mother's treatment that, in order to overcome his opposition, Walsingham had recourse to a somewhat hazardous device. He desired Gray to revive the story of Darnley's death, and to remind James that his father had been murdered by his mother. "I thank you," he said, "for sounding the king's disposition how he could be content to have the queen his mother proceeded against for the late fact. But I suppose it will be in vain to move him any farther in it, because he may conceive it would be against *bonos mores*, in respect of the bond of nature between them, that he should make himself a party against her. Nevertheless, you may with good reason persuade him that he make no mediation for her, or oppose himself against the course that is intended to be held with her, considering the hard measure that his father received at her hands, for which detestable fact she was deprived of her crown."[1] Whether Gray ventured to deliver this singular message we are not informed; but whether or not, the king remained for the present steadfast in his opposition to the proceedings about to be taken against his mother.

On the 6th of October, Sir Amias Paulet, Sir Walter Mildmay, and Mr Barker, a notary, demanded an

land will quake for fear."—Randolph to Archibald Douglas, 5th August; Murdin, 558.

[1] Papers relating to the Master of Gray, p. 110.

interview with the Queen of Scots, and presented to her a letter from Elizabeth. It stated briefly that Mary's practices had been discovered, and that certain of the chief nobles of the realm had been appointed to inquire into the very serious charges brought against her; that, living as she did under the protection of the laws of England, she was subject to those laws, and was therefore required to make answer to the commissioners specially appointed to hear the cause.

After hearing the letter read, Mary said that she was very sorry that the queen her good sister had thought fit to refuse all the offers made on her behalf. She had made every concession which in reason could be demanded of her; but she was well aware that she had many enemies in England, and that, whatever attempts were made, either by foreign princes or disaffected subjects, against the peace of the realm, would be laid to her charge. As to any plot against her majesty's person she was wholly innocent, and she challenged her accusers to prove that either by word or deed she had ever sanctioned any such attempt. As to the tone of her majesty's letter, she thought it very strange that she should address her in the language of command, as if she was a subject, and not a sovereign like herself. She would never, she added, "prejudice her rank and state, nor the blood whereof she was descended, nor her son who was to follow her," by consenting to answer as a subject of the Queen of England. She added that she had been deprived of all her papers, that she was ignorant of the laws and statutes of the realm, that she was wholly destitute of counsel, and that no man dared to

open his mouth on her behalf. Declining the jurisdiction of the Queen of England, she was willing to refer to foreign princes all matters of controversy between them.[1]

In the afternoon of the same day Paulet and Mildmay again repaired to her, and having read over her answer, inquired whether they had correctly set down her meaning. She replied in the affirmative, but added that she had omitted in the morning to notice one point of Elizabeth's letter—namely, that having enjoyed the protection of her laws, she was therefore subject to be tried by them. In answer to this, she desired to remind her sister queen that she had come to England of her own free will, and had ever since been treated as a prisoner, so that she "had enjoyed no protection of the laws of this land." And she desired that this should be added to her former answer.[2]

Lord Burghley and his brother commissioners, who arrived a few days afterwards at Fotheringay, were seriously perplexed by the attitude assumed by the Scottish queen. The most astute diplomatists and lawyers in Europe could not have furnished a better answer to the letter of Elizabeth than did this utterly friendless woman. To decline the jurisdiction of the commissioners was obviously her best course; and if she had adhered to it, they must either have abandoned their task altogether, or have pronounced judgment against her in her absence—a proceeding which, even in that day, would have been viewed with general dissatisfaction. Seriously alarmed at either prospect, Burghley, accompanied by the Lord Chancellor

[1] See her answer in Labanoff, vii. 36.

[2] Ibid., 39.

Bromley, repaired on the 13th of October to Mary's apartments, and exerted all his skill in seeking to persuade her to appear. He assured her, but without giving any authority for the assertion, that neither by the common, the civil, nor the canon law, could her objections to the competency of the commissioners be sustained; and he informed her, in conclusion, that if she persisted in her refusal to appear, they would, without further delay, proceed to trial in her absence.

Burghley ought by this time to have known Mary better than to have sought to gain his point by resorting to a threat. This coarse expedient, instead of frightening her into compliance, only drew from her an answer more peremptory and defiant than that which she had given to Paulet and Mildmay. She told the lord treasurer that she would rather die than acknowledge herself a subject, and that there was but one tribunal in England to which she was willing to submit herself, and that was a full and free Parliament. As for this commission, she knew not how it was composed. She knew not how far its members had bound themselves to find her guilty of the charges laid against her, and whether their meeting now was but an empty form. Perchance she was condemned already by those who had to try her; but she would have them "to look into their consciences, and to remember that the theatre of the world was wider than the realm of England."[1]

Burghley had sought to intimidate his victim, but she defied him; and perceiving his mistake, he forth-

[1] State Trials, i. 1170.

with changed his tone, and said he would address her, not as a commissioner, but as a confidential counsellor of his mistress. She, at least, had ever treated her with extraordinary favour, and had even punished certain persons who had questioned her right to the succession. Mary replied that she did not acknowledge such acts as favours; but after some further discussion, she finally consented to receive from Burghley a copy of the commission and a list of the commissioners, and promised that he and his colleagues should have a speedy and definite reply.[1]

As it was of the utmost consequence that she should be induced to appear, Sir Christopher Hatton, who was a member of the commission, was deputed to make a final attempt to overcome her scruples; and the supple courtier proved more successful than the old lord treasurer, who had overacted his part in his eager haste to secure his prey. "You are accused," said Hatton, "but not condemned. You say you are a queen; be it so. If you be innocent, you wrong your reputation in avoiding a trial. To examine into the matter, Queen Elizabeth hath appointed for commissioners most honourable, prudent, and upright men, who are ready to hear you, according to equity, with favour, and will rejoice with all their hearts if you shall clear yourself of this crime. Believe me, the queen herself will be much affected with joy, who affirmed unto me, at my coming from her, that never anything befell her more grievous than that you were charged with such a crime. Wherefore lay aside the bootless privilege of royal dignity; appear before your judges, and satisfy them of your innocence. If, on the

[1] State Trials, i. 1171.

other hand, you avoid a trial, you will lay an eternal blot upon your reputation."

Mary was more impressed by the plausible but deceptive arguments of Hatton than by the menaces of Burghley. But, as the next heir of the crown, she said she was only willing to appear before the "Estates of the realm, lawfully assembled," or before the queen in Council. "To the judgment of mine adversaries," she added, "amongst whom I know all defence of my innocence will be barred, flatly, I will not submit myself."

The lord chancellor, perceiving that unless some concession were made Mary would not yield, here interposed, and asked whether she would consent to appear if her protest against their jurisdiction were admitted. She said it appeared that their commission had been issued under the recent Act, which, as it had been passed solely with the object of rendering her amenable to the laws of England, she could in no way recognise. But on further consideration—and being much impressed, it is said, by the reasoning of Hatton—she finally consented to appear, on condition that her objection to the competency of the tribunal was recorded.

It must be admitted that this is a circumstance which weighs strongly in her favour. She was well aware that her correspondence had been intercepted, and if she had expressed a written approval of Babington's plot against Elizabeth, she must have justly dreaded the production of her letters. She would naturally, in such a case, have stood resolutely upon her privilege, and refused to appear. But if, as she again and again asserted, she had written to Babington

and to others only on the subject of her escape from confinement, the arguments of Hatton were calculated to produce a strong effect upon her mind, and even to inspire her with the hope that she might be able to satisfy at least some of the judges of her innocence.[1]

The commissioners assembled next morning, which was the 14th of October, in the great hall of the castle. At the upper end was placed a chair of state for the Queen of England. Opposite it, about the middle of the hall, stood a chair for the Queen of Scots. The commissioners were ranged on benches along the wall on either side; the earls on the right and the barons on the left. Of the former there were present the Earls of Oxford, Kent, Derby, Worcester, Rutland, Cumberland, Warwick, Pembroke, Lincoln, and Viscount Montacute, and with them sat the lord chancellor and the lord treasurer. On the other side were the Barons of Abergavenny, Zouch, Morley, Stafford, Grey, Lumley, Sturton, Sandes, Wentworth, Mordaunt, St John, Compton, and Cheyney. At some little distance from them sat the knights of the Privy Council—namely, Sir James Crofts, Sir Christopher Hatton, Sir Francis Walsingham, Sir Ralph Sadler,

[1] Elizabeth had been informed of the refusal of Mary to appear, in consequence of which she addressed to her the following characteristic letter:—

"You have in various ways attempted to deprive me of my life, and to bring ruin on my kingdom by shedding of blood. I have never proceeded so hardly against you, but on the contrary have cherished and preserved you as faithfully as if you were my own self. Your treasons will be proved and made manifest to you in that place where you now are. For this reason, it is our pleasure that you answer to the nobility and barons of my kingdom as you would do to myself were I there in person; and as my last injunction, I charge and command you to reply to them. *I have heard of your arrogance;* but *act candidly, and you may meet with more favour.*"—Life of Thomas Egerton, 86.

Sir Walter Mildmay, and Sir Amias Paulet. In front of the earls were the two chief-justices and the chief-baron of the Exchequer; and opposite them were four of their colleagues and two doctors of the civil law. The Crown was represented by the Attorney-General Popham, the Solicitor-General Egerton, and Gawdy, the queen's sergeant. And all these peers and judges and ministers of state had met together to hunt to death a helpless woman, who, by the invitation of their queen, had sought a refuge in her dominions. She was lame from rheumatism at the time, and appeared before them dressed in black, and leaning on the arm of her master of the household, Sir Andrew Melvill. "So many counsellors," she said, glancing at the formidable array before her as she entered the hall, "and not one for me." [1]

As soon as she had taken the seat prepared for her, the lord chancellor opened the proceedings by informing her that the Queen of England had heard with great grief that she had conspired against her life, and against the religion established in the realm; and it was the duty of the commissioners now present to inquire whether or not she was guilty of these serious crimes.

Mary then, rising from her seat, said she had come to England to seek the assistance of their queen, "which had been promised her," but that she had been made a prisoner on her arrival, and had been kept in prison ever since. She denied that the Queen of England had any jurisdiction over her, and she was

[1] "Voyant tous ces seigneurs et parmi eux force gens de justice, dit, 'Qu'il y avoit la beaucoup de gens de conseil, mais qu'il n'y en avoit pas un pour elle.'"—Letter of Chateauneuf of 20th October; Cheruel, 151.

only induced to appear that she might have an opportunity of refuting the unfounded charges made against her.

After some further discussion with the lord chancellor as to the effect of her protestation, the queen's sergeant, Gawdy, proceeded to address the commissioners on behalf of the Crown. He recounted at length the history of the Babington conspiracy, and laid before them the three letters to which we have already referred—namely, the letter of the Queen of Scots to Babington of the 25th of June, his long letter to her without date, and her reply of the 17th of July. Upon these three letters, as has been already stated, the charge against her entirely depended.

During the reading of Babington's letter to her, when mention was made of the Earl of Arundel, who was still a prisoner in the Tower, she was moved to tears, and exclaimed aloud, "Alas! what hath that noble house of Howard suffered for my sake!" Then resuming her self-possession, she said it was not likely that she should rely on the aid either of Arundel, who was in prison, or of Northumberland, who was an entire stranger to her, and but a youth.

Gawdy next proceeded to read her long letter to Babington of the 17th of July, upon which the case against her virtually depended. But in the words of the record, she "denied that she had ever received any such letter from him, or that she wrote any such letter to him, or that she was privy to his conspiracies, or that she did ever practise, compass, imagine, or was privy of, anything to the destruction of her majesty, or to the hurt of her person, confessing, nevertheless, that she had used Babington as an intelligencer for

her, and for the conveying of letters and packets; and she added, further, that she was not to be charged but by her word, or by her writing, and she was sure they had neither the one nor the other to lay against her."[1] Turning then to Walsingham, she observed that it was an easy matter to counterfeit ciphers, and she much feared that he had had recourse to this device, for she had reason to believe that he had conspired as well against her life as against that of her son.

It was impossible that Walsingham could remain silent under an imputation so terrible, and made in such a place. He rose from his seat, and called God to witness that in his private capacity he had done nothing unbecoming an honest man, and as a minister "he had done nothing unworthy of his place." The explanation, apparently so ample and sincere, was wholly unsatisfactory; for we know that Walsingham did not deem it "unworthy of his place" to conspire against the life of Esmé Stewart, as well as against that of the Earl of Arran; and we know that he subsequently approved of the project of putting Mary privately to death.

She was impressed, however, with the apparent earnestness of his denial, and begged he would forgive her if she had accused him wrongfully. She had only

[1] Hardwicke State Papers, i. 224 *et seq.* It is instructive to observe how systematically everything Mary said and did was misrepresented. When she declared that she had received no "such" letter from Babington, and had written no "such" letter to him, she clearly meant that both had been tampered with. But if we turn to the report of the trial by Lord Burghley's notaries, we find her declaring that "she knew not Babington, that she never received *any letters from him, nor wrote any to him.*"—State Trials, i. 1174. Can we believe that Mary said anything so absurd when she knew that her letters had been intercepted and her papers seized?

repeated in his presence what others had often reported of him behind his back. The queen's sergeant next proceeded to advert to a letter of Charles Paget on the subject of the invasion. But Mary promptly observed that this correspondence "was nothing to the purpose." She was charged with conspiring against the queen's life, not of seeking to recover her liberty by means of foreign aid.

Certain alleged confessions of Babington, and of her secretaries Nau and Curle, were next read; but of these not even copies have been preserved. It has been already stated that the only genuine confession of Babington now extant is wholly silent as regards the complicity of the Scottish queen. As to her secretaries, she insisted that they should be produced before her face to face. "I delivered nothing to them," she added, "but what nature delivered to me, that I might at length recover my liberty. I am not to be convicted but by mine own word and writing. If they have written anything which may be hurtful to the queen my sister, they have written it altogether without my knowledge, and let them bear the punishment. Sure I am, if they were here present, they would clear me of all blame in this cause." She concluded by again demanding that the notes of her letters in her own handwriting should be produced in proof of what she had alleged.[1]

To these most reasonable demands no answer was returned. Mary was not aware that, by an Act passed fifteen years before, witnesses in trials for high treason were required to be confronted with the accused;[2] and not one of her six-and-thirty judges was man

[1] State Trials, i. 1183.

[2] Stat. I. 13 Eliz.

enough to inform her of this important fact. All remained deaf to her appeals. Her secretaries were not examined; her notes were not produced. It was afterwards stated, in the Star Chamber, that these notes had been destroyed by her orders.[1] But in her presence no one ventured to make any such assertion.

Nothing, indeed, could have been more utterly worthless than the evidence produced against her. The letters were alleged to be copies of ciphers; but by whom the ciphers were deciphered, and by whom the copies were made, the commissioners were not informed, nor did they ask a question on the subject. Mary's secretaries might have been produced to identify the letter which Babington wrote to her, and Philipps could have been called to state whether the copy of Mary's letter produced was a true copy of the cipher sent by her. But her secretaries were kept close prisoners in London; and the name of Philipps, for obvious reasons, was not once mentioned throughout the trial. Lastly, her own notes or heads of her letter to Babington, to which she confidently appealed, were withheld from the commissioners, although these notes would have afforded conclusive proof of her innocence or guilt.

Mary's friends had asked for an advocate to plead her cause, but she required none. The defects she had herself so eloquently exposed in the case presented by her accusers, were absolutely fatal. The Crown

[1] Without any possibility of communicating with Nau, Mary here corroborated his statement that her notes were extant, and in the hands of Walsingham. The probability is, that they were destroyed by him or by Philipps when it was found that they contained no criminating matter against Mary.

counsel had not a word to say in reply; but Lord Burghley came to the rescue by suddenly changing the point of attack, and charging her with an intent to send her son to Spain, and to make over to Philip her pretended right to the English crown. Mary replied that she had no kingdom to convey, but that it was lawful for her to give away whatever things belonged to her, in which case she was accountable to no one. Burghley, still avoiding the real and only charge against her, next went back to the conspiracy of Parry, who, he alleged, had been instigated by Morgan to murder Elizabeth; and it was well known that Morgan was in the service of Mary, and received a pension from her. To this she replied that she only knew that Morgan had lost all for her sake, and she was bound in honour to relieve him. She further reminded the lord treasurer that pensions had been granted by his mistress to the Master of Gray and her other enemies in Scotland, and also to her son to induce him to abandon her.

Certain letters from Charles Paget and Mendoza were then read. Mary observed with truth that they did not touch the matter in question, for they contained nothing relating to the plot against the queen; and if foreign princes laboured to set her free, it was not to be laid to her charge, for, being detained a prisoner against all law and reason, she had frequently signified to Elizabeth that she would accept such aid.

With this reply of the Scottish queen terminated the first day's proceedings at Fotheringay; and it cannot be denied that, even according to their own account, and we have no other, she had maintained throughout a decisive superiority over her opponents. Without counsel or witnesses or papers, and armed

with nothing but her own clear intellect and heroic spirit, she had answered, point by point, all their allegations. Knowing the weakness of their proofs, they had artfully mixed up the charge of conspiracy with the scheme of invasion; and Burghley, taking upon himself the functions of Crown prosecutor, had sought to draw her attention from the main question in dispute by dwelling on a variety of topics, which were only intended to bewilder and confuse her. But apparently perceiving his design, she brought him back again and again to the real point at issue between them; while to her repeated demands that her secretaries should be confronted with her, and that her papers should be produced, he carefully avoided a reply.

On the following day it is worthy of note that neither the attorney nor the solicitor general, nor the queen's sergeant, took any part in the proceedings. Whether he was dissatisfied with the mode in which they had conducted the case, or whether he was desirous of displaying at once his erudition and his animosity against the Scottish queen, Burghley took upon himself the entire management of the trial. Such conduct on the part of a judge was neither dignified nor decent, nor do we find in any other of the State Trials of this reign so marked a departure from established usage.

When the commissioners met, Mary first demanded and received a copy of her protestation against the legality of their proceedings. She then declared that, although she had made every concession to Elizabeth that could in reason be desired, her proposals had been invariably disregarded, even although she had offered

her son, and the son of the Duke of Guise, as hostages for their due performance. She was now arraigned before a foreign tribunal, and accused by foreign lawyers, with no other purpose than that her lawful title to the English crown should be defeated. She reminded her judges that their mistress had been accused, and unjustly accused, of complicity in Wyatt's rebellion, and she was no more guilty of conspiring against Elizabeth than Elizabeth was of conspiring against her sister. She did, indeed, most earnestly desire to relieve the Catholics from the grievous persecutions which they now endured; but she would rather have recourse to the prayers of Hester than to the sword of Judith, and would trust to the mercy of God rather than deprive of life the meanest of the people. She concluded by demanding that there should be another hearing, and that, as she was unacquainted with the laws of England, she should be allowed an advocate to plead her cause, or that, being a queen, she might be believed on the word of a queen. She saw most plainly that her judges were filled with prejudice against her, and it would be the extreme of folly and injustice, as the case now stood, to proceed to judgment. "I came to England," she continued, "relying upon the friendship and the promises of your queen. Look here, my lords," she exclaimed, drawing a ring from her finger, "at this pledge of love and protection which I received from your mistress. Regard it well. Trusting to this pledge I came amongst you. You all know how it has been kept."[1] This was no doubt the ring which Elizabeth had sent to Mary

[1] Courcell's Negotiations, 18; Bannatyne Club edition. This incident is not mentioned in Burghley's report of the trial.

when she was a prisoner at Lochleven, and to which reference has been already made.[1]

Burghley in reply could only recapitulate in his own laborious fashion the evidence that had already been laid before the commissioners. Mary occasionally interrupted him by demanding that her papers should be restored to her, and that her secretaries should be examined in her presence. No one else interfered in the proceedings. The solicitor-general did venture to make one remark[2] towards the close of the day, but he was promptly silenced by Burghley, who, in his triple capacity of Crown prosecutor, judge, and minister of state, had acquitted himself to his own entire satisfaction. It may perhaps be taken as a proof of his declining powers that he had even the vanity to boast of the skill and success with which he had encountered and defeated the "Queen of the Castle," as he facetiously termed the woman against whose life and reputation he had plotted incessantly for more than twenty years. "I did so encounter her," he said, "with reasons out of my knowledge and experience, as she had not that advantage that she looked for,"[3] &c. We have only to regret that in his anxiety to preserve, for the benefit of posterity, these specimens of his oratory, he should have deemed his adversary unworthy of the like attention. But he reports his own speeches at full length in *the first person;*

[1] See *ante*, p. 251.

[2] He reminded the commissioners of the consequences that would result from the conveyance of the kingdom to a foreign prince. "But the lord treasurer showed that the kingdom of England could not be conveyed, but was to descend by right of succession, according to the laws."—State Trials, 1188.

[3] Burghley to Davison, 15th October; Caligula, c. ix. f. 433.

while those of Mary, being no doubt in his eyes comparatively unimportant, are given in the *third*. We may fairly conclude, therefore, that we have but an imperfect account of what she said before her judges, and that some material portions of her defence may have been omitted.

"Judgment will be given at our next meeting,"[1] Burghley wrote in triumph to Davison on the conclusion of the proceedings at Fotheringay. He could no doubt have persuaded the commissioners to pronounce sentence on the spot; but irresolute to the last, Elizabeth commanded an adjournment to the Star Chamber, a fit place for the consummation of the work they had in hand. The hesitation of the queen to consent to her cousin's death was regarded by Walsingham as a special mark of the divine wrath. To such outrageous conclusions will even the ablest men come when heated by religious and political antipathies. It was to Leicester that this pious sentiment was addressed, and it very probably hastened his departure from the Netherlands.[2]

On the 25th of October the commissioners again met in the Star Chamber at Westminster, and according to the very meagre report of the proceedings, Mary's two secretaries, Nau and Curle, were on this occasion both produced. No question appears to have been put to them by any one, but they are merely said to have affirmed upon oath certain declarations and confessions, of which neither the originals nor even the copies have been preserved. The only additional piece of evidence produced in the Star Chamber was

[1] Burghley to Davison, 15th October; Caligula, c. ix. f. 433.
[2] Leicester arrived in England in the last week of November.

an alleged declaration of Curle "that as well the letter which Babington did write to the Scots queen, as the draughts of her answer to the same, were both burned at her command." But it is obvious that a statement of such importance, if true, ought to have been made, and certainly would have been made, in the presence of the accused; it is equally obvious that, if false, it could only have been safely made behind her back, when there was no possibility of contradiction.

The commissioners, with one exception, found Mary guilty, not of the various matters laid to her charge by Lord Burghley, but of having compassed and imagined, since the 1st of June aforesaid, divers matters tending to the hurt, death, and destruction of the Queen of England. Lord Zouch alone had the spirit to dissent from the sentence, declaring that he was not satisfied that "she had compassed, practised, or imagined" the death of the Queen of England. The commissioners further added to their sentence the following politic declaration: "That the said sentence did derogate nothing from James King of Scots in title or honour, but that he was the same in place, degree, and right as if the same sentence had never been pronounced."

Thus ended the most disgraceful of all the judicial iniquities which disgrace the history of England. In every other trial of any person of distinction during the long reign of Elizabeth, at least some witnesses were examined in open court. In this alone, the most important of all, not a single witness was produced. To arraign the accused at Fotheringay in the absence of the witnesses, and to produce the witnesses at Westminster in the absence of the accused, was a

mockery of justice unexampled even in this sanguinary age. And this was not the only iniquity committed on the trial of Mary Stewart. Of the various documents produced against her not one was original. They were not even copies of written papers. They were only alleged to be copies of ciphers on the credit of men who were not confronted with the accused, and whose signatures, attached to their alleged confessions, were either obtained through fear of torture or forged by Philipps. To attach the smallest credit to any such documents would be to disregard the plainest rules of evidence recognised by all civilised communities for the discovery of truth.

A few days after the proceedings in the Star Chamber a Parliament was held at Westminster, and both Houses adopted an address to Elizabeth praying that the sentence might be forthwith executed against the Queen of Scots. "We cannot find," they said, "that there is any possible means to provide for your majesty's safety but by the just and speedy execution of the said queen, the neglecting whereof may procure the heavy displeasure and punishment of Almighty God, as by sundry severe examples of His great justice in that behalf left us in the sacred Scriptures doth appear," &c. To this address Elizabeth made a very able and a very artful reply. "Though my life," she said, "hath been dangerously shot at, yet I protest there is nothing hath more grieved me than that one not differing from me in sex, of like rank and degree, of the same stock, and most nearly allied to me in blood, hath fallen into so great a crime; and," she continued, "even yet, though the matter be come thus far, if she would truly repent, and no man would undertake her

cause against me, and if my life alone depended hereupon, and not the safety and welfare of my whole people, I would, I protest unfeignedly, most willingly pardon her. Nay, if England might by my death attain a more flourishing estate and a better prince, I would most gladly lay down my life; for for your sakes it is, and for my people's, that I desire to live. As for me, I see no such great cause why I should either be fond to live or fear to die," &c. After continuing for some time in the same strain, she suddenly changed her tone. "I will now tell you a secret," she said, "though it is well known that I have the property to keep counsel. It is not long since these eyes of mine saw and read an oath, wherein some bound themselves to kill me within a month; hereby I see your danger in me, which I will be very careful to avoid." She then concluded by informing them that as the matter now in hand was very rare, and of the greatest consequence, they must not look for any present decision, for they knew it was her custom to deliberate long, even in matters that were unimportant as compared with this.

Her words were well calculated to produce the effect which she no doubt desired. While expressing the utmost reluctance to proceed to extremities against her kinswoman, she took care, by artfully alluding to the existence of fresh plots, of which beyond her own assertion we have no proof, to keep alive the spirit of fanatical hostility against the Queen of Scots by which she well knew both Houses were animated.

After a delay of twelve days she sent a message to both Houses, in which she desired them to reconsider afresh the whole matter, "and to devise some better

remedy, whereby both the Queen of Scots' life might be spared and her own security provided for." After earnest consultation, both Houses again declared that the death of the Queen of Scots was essential to the security of the realm. They relied chiefly, as they had done on a former occasion, on the examples furnished by the Old Testament. They reminded their mistress how Saul incurred God's vengeance for sparing Agag, and how those magistrates were commended for putting Jezebel to death. As to the ties of blood, they reminded her of the wisdom of Solomon, who had not spared his own brother when under suspicion of treason. "Therefore we pray you," they continued, "for the cause of God, His Church, this realm, ourselves, and yourself, that you will no longer be careless of your life or sovereign safety, nor longer suffer religion to be threatened, the realm to stand in danger, nor us to dwell in fear."

The reply of Elizabeth to this appeal was as follows: "I pray you for the present to content yourselves with an answer without answer. Your judgment I condemn not, neither do I mistake your reasons, but pray you to accept my thankfulness; excuse my doubtfulness; and take in good part my answer, answerless. If I should say I would not do what you request, I might say perhaps more than I think; and if I should say I would do it, I might plunge myself into peril, whom you labour to preserve, which in your wisdom and discretion ye would not that I should, if ye consider the circumstances of place, time, and the manners and conditions of men."[1] We may probably conclude, not from these ambiguous sentences, but from her

[1] State Trials, i. 1201.

subsequent conduct, that Elizabeth had by this time made up her mind to take her cousin's life; but as to the mode, the place, and the time, she was still undetermined. Lord Buckhurst, and Beale, clerk of the Council, meanwhile proceeded to Fotheringay to announce to Mary that sentence of death had been pronounced against her in the Star Chamber. But in communicating to her the not unlooked-for intelligence, Buckhurst and Beale were indiscreet enough to let out the true cause of her condemnation by informing her that, "as long as she lived, the received religion in England could not subsist." This admission seems to have given Mary much satisfaction, for their report states that "she seemed with a certain unwonted alacrity to triumph, giving God thanks, and rejoicing in her heart that she was held to be an instrument for the re-establishing of religion in this island."[1] She earnestly desired, as she was about to die, that her almoner, who was an inmate of the castle, but whom she had not been permitted to see since her papers were seized at Chartley, might be allowed to visit her. But this request was refused, with an intimation that she might avail herself of the services of the bishop of the diocese, or the Dean of Peterborough, an offer which Mary peremptorily declined. After some further discourse, in which Mary observed that the English nation[2] had never been remarkable for humanity, Elizabeth's envoys took their leave.

Mary now made her last requests to Elizabeth in the following terms:—

"Madam, I thank God with all my heart that it has pleased Him, through you, to put an end to the weari-

[1] State Trials, i. 1201. [2] Ibid.

some pilgrimage of my life. I do not ask that it be prolonged, having had too much experience of its bitterness. I only entreat your majesty, since I can look for no favour at the hands of certain zealous ministers who hold the first place in the councils of England, that you yourself, and no other, will grant me the following requests.

"I ask, in the first place, as I cannot hope for a burial in England according to the Catholic rites practised under the ancient kings, your ancestors and mine, and as in Scotland the tombs of my progenitors have been violated, that as soon as my enemies shall have been satiated with my innocent blood, my remains may be carried by my servants to some consecrated ground, to be there interred; above all, I desire in France, where rest the ashes of my much-honoured mother. Thus at length may this poor body find the repose, which living it has never known.

"Secondly, I pray your majesty, from the fears with which I regard the men to whose tyranny you have abandoned me, that I may not be put to death in secret, but in the sight of my servants and others, who may be able to testify to my faith and obedience to the true Church, and defend my memory against the calumnies which my enemies may spread abroad concerning me.

"In the third place, I ask that my attendants, who have served me through all my miseries so faithfully and well, may be allowed to go freely where they please, and to retain the small legacies which my poverty has enabled me to bequeath to them.

"I conjure you, madam, by the blood of Jesus Christ, by our relationship, by the memory of Henry VII.,

our common ancestor, and by the title of queen, which I bear with me to the death, not to refuse these most reasonable requests, and to assure me by a word in your own hand that you will do so. I shall then die as I have lived, your affectionate sister and prisoner."

It is probable that this letter was carried to London by Buckhurst and Beale, but it is doubtful whether Elizabeth ever received it. It is certain that she neither answered it nor complied with Mary's requests. Anticipating a speedy death, Mary now addressed a letter to the Duke of Guise. As she considered him, since the desertion of her son, her nearest kinsman, she probably expressed to him the true state of her feelings at this anxious time; and if so, it is very obvious that in her own belief she was about to die for her religion. As the whole letter is highly characteristic, it is given entire, as follows:—

"My good cousin, whom I esteem above all the world, I bid you farewell, being about to suffer death by an unjust sentence, and in a manner that has never fallen to the lot of any of our race, and still less to one of my rank; but, my good cousin, give thanks to the Almighty, for I was useless to the world and to the cause of God and His Church in the condition in which I lived, and I hope that my death will testify my constancy in the faith, and my readiness to die for the maintenance and the restoration of the Catholic Church in this unfortunate isle; and although our blood has never yet been soiled by the hands of the headsman, be not ashamed, my friend; for the judgment of heretics and enemies of the Church, who have no jurisdiction over me, an independent queen, is profitable before God to the children of the Church. If

I had embraced their religion, I should have avoided this blow. All our race have been persecuted by this sect—witness your good father, with whom I hope to be received in mercy by the just Judge. I recommend, therefore, to you my poor servants, the discharge of my debts, and that you would found an annual mass for my soul, not at your own cost, but make the requisite arrangements, and you shall hear further as to my intentions from my poor desolate attendants, who will witness the last act of the approaching tragedy.

"May God prosper you, and your wife and children, your brothers and cousins, and above all our chief,[1] my good brother and cousin, and all that belongs to him; I would recommend your children to the blessing of God as I would my own, cruelly abused by fortune though I have been.[2]

"You will receive tokens from me to remind you when to offer up prayers for the soul of your poor cousin, deprived of all aid and counsel but that of God, who gives me force and courage to defy alone the wolves that are howling for my blood—the glory be to Him!

"Give credit in particular to one who will deliver to you a ruby ring from me; you may rely on all he tells you, especially as regards my poor servants, and the condition and character of each. I recommend this person to you for his sterling sincerity and honesty, which well entitle him to some place of trust. I have chosen him as one upon whom I can rely for faithfully executing my commands. I pray you let it not be

[1] The Duke of Lorraine.

[2] This allusion to her son shows that, with the prospect of a speedy death, she had forgiven his cruel desertion of her.

known that I have written to you on his behalf, as in that case the envy of some might do him harm.

"I have suffered much these last two years and more, but God be praised for all! May He give you grace to persevere in the service of the Church so long as you have life; and never may this honour depart from our house, of which the men as well as women have been ever prompt to shed their blood in the quarrel of the faith, all worldly considerations cast aside. For myself, I am bound both on my father's and my mother's side to sacrifice my life in this behalf, and I will not disgrace the parentage whence I have sprung. May Jesus crucified for us, and all the holy martyrs, render us through their intercession worthy of the sacrifice!

"From Fotheringay, this Tuesday, 24th November.—They have removed my 'dais,' intending thereby to humiliate me; and my keeper has informed me that this has not been done by the orders of their queen, but by the advice of certain of her Council. I replied, instead of replacing my arms, by putting up the Cross of my Redeemer. You shall hear all that passed. They have been more amiable since. — Your affectionate cousin and most sincere friend."

In another letter, written on the same day, to the Archbishop of Glasgow, she explained the manner in which her "dais," or cloth of state, had been removed. Sir Amias Paulet, accompanied by Sir Drue Drury,[1] who had been appointed to assist him in the performance of his duties, entered her apartments, and informed her that as she had been found guilty of

[1] Sir Drue Drury arrived at Fotheringay on the 13th November.—Labanoff, vi. 443.

treason, she was now dead in point of law, and was no longer to be treated as a queen. She replied that she was indebted for her rank to God alone, and that He alone could deprive her of it. Paulet then called in his servants and desired them to remove the cloth of state; and as soon as his orders had been obeyed, he sat down in the presence of his prisoner and put on his hat. Then pointing to a billiard-table which stood in the room, he said she ought no longer to indulge in such vain pastimes, and ordered his attendants to take it away. The ruffianly behaviour of Paulet upon this occasion was so much in keeping with his general character and conduct, that Mary seems to have been in no way surprised. She only remarked, on the removal of the billiard-table, that she had for the present abundance of other occupations.[1]

She expressed to the archbishop her firm belief that she was about to die for her religion; and she added with a touch of bitterness, of which we find few traces in her letters, that if for the repose of the kingdom the people of England thought it necessary to take her life, they were welcome to it in return for the twenty years' imprisonment to which they had condemned her. In a postscript she informed him, further, that in seeking to justify the sentence that had been passed upon her, it was now given out that she had put herself under the protection of Elizabeth from necessity and not from choice, and that she was on that account amenable to the laws of England. To refute this fresh calumny, she desired Beaton to obtain from the Laird of Lochinvar, and from the heirs of Lord Herries and of the Archbishop of St Andrews, a de-

[1] Mary to the Archbishop of Glasgow; Labanoff, vi. 466.

claration which they had signed expressly stating that she was about to proceed to England upon her own responsibility, and against their wishes and advice. These papers appear to be no longer extant; but there can be no doubt that what she here stated was strictly true, and that, relying upon the promises of Elizabeth, she repaired to England in opposition to the advice of her best friends.[1]

On the same day Mary wrote farewell letters to the Pope[2] and to Mendoza;[3] and she was afterwards allowed an interview with her almoner, Le Preau, an indulgence which she probably owed to the intervention of Buckhurst and Beale. She took the opportunity of placing in the hands of her spiritual attendant the letters which she had written to her friends, but which do not appear to have reached them until after her death.

There can be no doubt that Mary wrote these letters in the belief that the sentence pronounced against her would be executed without delay. But many weeks had yet to elapse before Elizabeth could make up her mind to that irrevocable step. In the mean time she gave orders that Mary should be allowed to avail herself of the services of her almoner; and she also desired Paulet to return to her a portion of her money, which had been seized at Chartley, with an assurance that the whole should be restored.[4] Mary replied in very grateful terms, and sent her a ring in

[1] *Ante*, vol. i. 382. [2] Sextus Quintus.—Labanoff, vi. 447.

[3] Labanoff, vi. 457. From a note on the margin, it appears that Mendoza did not receive this letter until the 15th October 1587; Labanoff, 461.

[4] Whether Elizabeth kept her promise we do not know.—See Mary to Elizabeth; Labanoff, vi. 475.

acknowledgment of these unlooked-for favours. She also desired permission to send a jewel to her son, with her last farewell and her last blessing, and concluded by earnestly repeating the requests she had made in her former letter regarding her death and burial. Elizabeth was moved to tears[1] by this appeal, the last that Mary ever made to her; but no answer was returned, and no attention was paid to her requests.

The critical situation of Mary was now well known in Paris and Madrid; but Philip, being at open war with Elizabeth, could take no steps in her behalf. The Kings of Scotland and of France, however, protested energetically against the execution of the sentence which had been passed upon her. Archibald Douglas was at this time the representative of James in London, and he received instructions to remonstrate with Elizabeth on the subject; but it was strongly suspected that a man who had been one of the murderers of the king's father would not prove a very zealous advocate in the cause of the mother.[2]

From France, in consequence apparently of the exertions of Chateauneuf, a special envoy arrived in London on the 21st November. The person selected by Henry to intercede for the life of his sister-in-law was M. de Bellièvre, afterwards Chancellor of France. He entreated Elizabeth to grant him an immediate audience; but it was rumoured on his arrival that some of his

[1] "There is a letter from the Scottish queen that hath wrought tears, but I trust shall do no further harm, albeit the delay is too dangerous." —Leicester to Walsingham; Ellis, iii. 22.

[2] "Archibald Douglas doth very ill offices in the name of his sovereign against the Scottish queen."—Courcelles' Negotiations, by the Bannatyne Club, p. 14.

suite were infected with the plague, and that other of his attendants had engaged to assassinate the English queen;[1] and under these absurd pretexts, which were wholly without foundation, she delayed granting his request until the 28th of November. On that day, accompanied by Chateauneuf, he repaired to Richmond, where Elizabeth received, with due formality, the two ambassadors. In a long and elaborate harangue, abounding with historical allusions and classical quotations, Bellièvre extolled the virtues of clemency and moderation, and strongly urged upon Elizabeth, upon political as well as moral grounds, the expediency of sparing her cousin's life.[2] Her reply to this appeal was brief, earnest, and even in parts pathetic. She assured the two ambassadors, and probably with truth, that no misfortune that had ever befallen her had caused her such deep affliction as this affair of the Queen of Scots.[3] "But," she added, "I am surrounded by spies. I am a prisoner in my own kingdom. I always desired to live in peace, yet I am threatened with a host of enemies. I am but a poor weak woman, but I trust that God will preserve from danger me and my people, and all Christian princes." To the appeal of the French envoys she gave no distinct reply, but they appear to have understood from the language and bearing of Elizabeth that their intercession was hopeless. In private, Bellièvre was assured by Burghley,

[1] Egerton, 6.

[2] The speech of Bellièvre occupies thirteen pages of Teulet.—T. iv. 116.

[3] "Jamais quelques afflictions et facheries que j'aye receues, comme de la mort du roy mon père, du roy mon frère, et de la royne ma sœur, ne m'ont tant touché au cœur comme le subject dont nous traictons," &c.—Teulet, iv. 129.

Walsingham, and Hatton, that their mistress might as well sign her own death-warrant as spare Mary's life, and that the sacrifice of one queen was essential to the security of the other. If they spoke truly, they had to thank their own diplomacy for this miserable result.

Another week elapsed, and Bellièvre was admitted to a second audience. The language of Elizabeth on this occasion was still less encouraging than during the former interview. She complained that the King of France had protected Morgan and Charles Paget, instead of delivering them up to be punished for their crimes. With respect to the Queen of Scots, she spoke more strongly than on the previous occasion. She said she had in vain sought some means by which her life might be preserved without danger to her own; and she added that she did not believe that the King of France could desire that the innocent should suffer while the guilty escaped.[1]

To discourage further solicitations on the part of foreign Powers, an appeal was now made to the passions of the people. On the 6th of December the sentence against the Queen of Scots was publicly proclaimed by the civic authorities of London amidst the ringing of bells, the blazing of bonfires, and other demonstrations of fanatical enthusiasm. Upon witnessing this display, the French envoy was alarmed lest advantage would be taken of it to put the Queen of Scots immediately to death, and he besought Elizabeth that before the execution took place she would at least allow him time to communicate with his master. Elizabeth, unwilling to come to an open rupture with

[1] Life of Egerton, 91.

the French king, agreed to a delay of twelve days. In this interval, Henry desired Bellièvre to represent to Elizabeth, if all other arguments failed, that he should consider the execution of his sister-in-law as an offence against the acknowledged rights of sovereigns which he could never sanction. Elizabeth was spending her Christmas at Greenwich; and on the 27th December, Bellièvre was admitted to her presence for the last time. He commenced, as on the former occasion, by appealing to her humanity; but finding that he made no impression, he proceeded to deliver his master's message. Elizabeth was, or affected to be, highly indignant; and she asked whether he had the written instructions of Henry to hold such language to her. Bellièvre replied in the affirmative; whereupon she demanded a copy of his instructions, and after some further discourse, said she would send a special envoy to France, who would acquaint the king with her final resolution on the subject.[1]

Embarrassed by the resolute attitude of the French king, Elizabeth and her ministers had now recourse to one of those disreputable devices with which the history of her reign abounds. On the day upon which Bellièvre quitted England, M. de Chateauneuf was accused of plotting against her life. The charge—which, it was afterwards acknowledged, was wholly without foundation—was made by a man of most dissolute character and habits, William Stafford, a brother of Elizabeth's ambassador in France.[2] It is difficult to believe that her ministers could have attached the smallest credit to the story; but we can readily believe that Stafford may have made the charge with their

[1] Life of Egerton, 101.

[2] Sir Edward Stafford.

connivance, or even at their instigation. As it was, they affected to treat the affair as one of great importance. The letters and despatches of Chateauneuf were intercepted, and one of his secretaries named Destrappes was arrested and sent to the Tower. The ambassador himself was summoned before the Council to answer for his share in the pretended plot, and Wade was sent on a special mission to Paris to explain the cause of these extraordinary proceedings. As no evidence could be produced against the French ambassador, no further steps were taken in the matter. But the object of Elizabeth and her ministers was gained. They completely paralysed for the time the efforts of Henry on behalf of his sister-in-law; and after she had been put to death, the most ample apologies were made to him and his ambassador, who were assured that the charges made by Stafford were unfounded, and that the whole affair had originated in a mistake.[1]

In Scotland, the news that Mary had been condemned to death was received with deep and general indignation. The Reformed clergy alone regarded with satisfaction the approaching fate of their sovereign. Although commanded by the king, they obstinately refused to pray for her, and even threatened with the wrath of heaven those who obeyed the order.[2] To induce the king to leave his mother to

[1] Camden, 520; Murdin, 378, 583. "Avoient ces beaux conseillers d'Angleterre forgé, falsifié, et composé toutes telles escritures qu'ils avoient voullu sur ce faict par eux inventé et projetté. Car il faut notter que jamais n'e produisent *les memes pieces originaulx des procedures mais seulement des copies*," &c.—Régistre de Villeroy in Egerton.

[2] At this time James had desired Archbishop Adamson to offer up prayers for the queen; but on entering the High Church, where that prelate officiated, the king found to his astonishment that the pulpit was

her fate, Walsingham had sent him copies of her alleged correspondence with Babington, and also took care to remind him that she had made over to Philip her pretended right to the English crown. The French ambassador in Scotland, on the other hand, M. de Courcelles, did his utmost to persuade him to interfere energetically in her behalf. His efforts were warmly seconded by the chief of the nobility, who regarded as an unpardonable affront the conduct of Elizabeth in bringing their sovereign to trial before an English tribunal.[1] Angus, despite his Calvinistic prejudices, with Huntly, Bothwell, Herries, and Lord Claud Hamilton, all declared for open war rather than allow the sentence to be executed. James having asked the advice of Bothwell on the subject, that nobleman replied, "I think if your majesty allows the matter to proceed you should be hanged yourself the day after."[2] George Douglas, who was at the time in Scotland, also warmly advocated the cause of the sovereign for whom he had sacrificed so much; and in spite of the warnings of

occupied by a Presbyterian minister named Cowper. The king, addressing him from his seat, said that that place was intended for another, but that if he would pray for the queen he might remain. Cowper answered that he would do as the Spirit of God directed him. Taking this reply as a refusal, James commanded him to leave the pulpit. Cowper refused to do so, upon which the king's attendants were about to eject him by force, when he descended, declaring that this hour would rise up in witness against the king in the great day of the Lord.—Tytler, 339.

[1] "Angus declared that he would plainly tell his sovereign, if he see him cold in his mother's cause, that he may do what he please, but that himself and the rest of the nobility will not endure that the Queen of England shall put her hands in his mother's blood, who could not be blamed if she had caused the Queen of England's throat to be cut for detaining her so long unjustly prisoner."—Courcelles to D'Esneval, 31st October, p. 13.

[2] Tytler, viii. 333.

Walsingham, James, after some hesitation, at length determined to make an energetic attempt to save his mother's life. He addressed a letter to Elizabeth couched in stronger language than he had ever before employed to the English queen, and he wrote to Walsingham, whom he regarded as the most active of his mother's enemies, in terms still more peremptory and menacing; and he despatched them by a special envoy, Sir William Keith, who fulfilled his mission with fidelity and zeal. But his remonstrances had no other effect than to throw Elizabeth into one of those paroxysms of passion which, whether they were genuine or counterfeited for the occasion, so often perplexed her ministers and frightened her attendants. She assailed Keith with a torrent of abuse, and she wrote to James complaining loudly of his audacity in venturing to intercede for his mother's life. She knew his mean and selfish nature, and her language had the desired effect. He wrote a letter of apology for the terms in which he had addressed her, and he committed it to the treacherous hands of the Master of Gray.[1] In selecting this man for such a mission, James virtually left his mother to her fate.

Before leaving Scotland, Gray had recommended that the unhappy queen, for whose life he was instructed to intercede, should be put to death by poison;[2] and Walsingham, to whom the advice was

[1] Tytler, viii. 336, who quotes James's apology from Warrender MSS.

[2] Courcelles to Henry III., 31st December; Egerton, 97. We have additional proof that Gray recommended the assassination of Mary; for shortly after her death he was accused of this specific crime and found guilty, "in especial that he wrote to England and found fault that they had not, in so long a time, found a means to cut off the king's mother privately."—Calderwood, iv. 613. This was in May 1587. His life was

given, if we may judge from his subsequent conduct, was not averse to this expedient. Gray was, in fact, most unwilling to undertake the duty now imposed upon him. Writing to Archibald Douglas, even before Mary's trial, he says, speaking of the position of the king, "this is a hard matter, to speak truly, to the king our sovereign, not to make any mediation for his mother; and yet the matter is also hard on the other side for you and me, for I know, as God liveth, *it shall be a staff for our own heads;*" and he adds, "if matters might stand well between the queen's majesty there (Elizabeth) and our sovereign, *I care not although she were out of the way.*"[1]

On the 21st of October, Gray again wrote to his friend Douglas as follows: "The king is very instant for his mother, and minds to charge me with a commission to that effect, in case you prevail not; but I shall shift all till I hear from you. *For the commission for his mother, I like it not.*"[2] On the 9th of December, again writing to Douglas, after it had been determined to send him to England, he says: "As for this commission I am charged with, I cannot eschew it; but answer to the queen there (Elizabeth), and all my favourable friends, that they shall *find me always constant*, and that in my negotiations I shall *know nothing but for their contentments.* Of this assure them, and promise it in my name."[3]

spared through the intercession of Lord Claud Hamilton, but he was banished from Scotland.

[1] Lodge, ii. 289. The letter is dated 11th October. [2] Ibid.

[3] Lodge, ii. 294. It was originally intended that the Earl of Bothwell should have accompanied Gray and Melvill on their mission to Elizabeth; but Courcelles says that Bothwell was not sent, "by the drift, it was thought, of the Master of Gray and Archibald Douglas, knowing the said

Gray arrived in London in the beginning of January, accompanied by Sir Robert Melvill. That Melvill, like Keith, was zealous in the cause of the unhappy queen, there is no reason to doubt; but it is impossible to believe that James was at this time sincere in his efforts to save his mother when he employed for the purpose a man who, he knew, had betrayed her under circumstances of peculiar aggravation, and of whose unwillingness to undertake the task imposed upon him he could not have been ignorant. There was now, in fact, no real obstacle to the execution of Mary. The sanction of the English Parliament had been obtained, and the populace were clamorous for the blood of the Papist queen. No intervention was to be apprehended from foreign Powers, for with the King of Spain Elizabeth was actually at war; the King of France had been silenced by a trick, which, however despicable, answered the purpose for the time; and the King of Scots had sent an ambassador to London, ostensibly to intercede for his mother, but who in private urged Elizabeth, on every opportunity, to take her life. Although in two formal audiences, on the 6th and 10th of January, Gray remonstrated with Elizabeth according to the letter of his instructions, he was universally believed to have assured her that, although for the sake of appearances James had deemed it necessary to intercede for his

earl to be prompt and free of speech, and affectionate to the Queen of Scots, and such a one as would not, if he discovered any of the treacheries which were most suspected by him, conceal it." — Courcelles to the French king, 31st December; Negotiations, 22.

In another letter to the French king, Courcelles says, "Gray, who, in truth, with Archibald Douglas, may be said to have been the murderers of this poor princess"—p. 46.

mother, he was far less anxious to save her life than to secure the reversion of the English crown.

But there can be no doubt that, in spite of her lofty language to the ambassadors of Henry and James, Elizabeth regarded with terrible misgivings the catastrophe which her ministers, and especially Burghley, Walsingham, and Leicester, sought to persuade her was now inevitable. She could not but perceive that it must in any event be fraught with serious danger, and that even if the anticipations of her counsellors were realised, they would reap all the profit, while on her would rest all the infamy of the deed. We need not, therefore, be surprised that she spent a miserable winter, more miserable to all appearance than her victim, who, in the firm belief that she was about to die for her religion, awaited with perfect resignation the impending blow. Elizabeth meanwhile shunned all amusement, and spent her days and nights in gloomy silence, or in repeating certain phrases to herself which betrayed to her attendants the violence and depth of her emotions. She was often heard to say that "she must either strike or be struck down;"[1] while on every opportunity Gray would whisper in her ear, "The dead don't bite."[2] She succumbed at last to the intolerable conflict, and to the incessant efforts of Mary's enemies, and consented, at the instigation apparently both of Gray and Leicester, that she should be privately put to death.

Some time before—the date is not known—Elizabeth had addressed a letter to Sir Amias Paulet,[3]

[1] Camden, 534.

[2] "Mortui non mordent."—Camden.

[3] This letter, a copy of which is preserved in the Record Office, was in

thanking him in glowing terms for his services in connection with the Babington conspiracy, and hinting obscurely that further demands were to be made upon his loyalty, for which he should receive some extraordinary reward. The mystery was explained in a letter which was addressed to him on the 1st of February by the two secretaries Walsingham and Davison. It was written on that day by the express desire of Elizabeth, after a conversation she had had with Davison, of which he has left us a full and highly interesting report.

Burghley had drawn up the warrant for Mary's execution as soon as sentence had been pronounced against her; but up to this time, under one pretext or another, Elizabeth had refused to sign it. On the morning of the 1st of February, while the Court was still at Greenwich, Davison received a message from the Lord High Admiral Howard, who informed him that he had just had an interview with the queen, and that she desired him to bring to her the warrant, that it might be signed and despatched without delay. Davison accordingly repaired to the palace with the

the following terms: "Amias, my most faithful servant, God reward thee treblefold in the double for thy most troublesome charge, so well discharged. If you knew, my Amias, how kindly, besides dutifully, my grateful heart accepteth your double labours and faithful actions, your wise orders and safe conduct performed in so dangerous and crafty a charge, it would ease your travail and rejoice your heart, in that I cannot balance in any weight of my judgment the value that I prize you at, and suppose no treasure to countervail such a faith, and shall condemn myself in that fault which I never committed if I reward not such deserts. Yea, let me lack when I have most need if I acknowledge not such a merit with a reward, *non omnibus datum*," &c.—Strype, iii. 361. The letter is without date, but was probably written after the arrest of Mary's secretaries, and the seizure of her papers at Chartley.

warrant, which was in his possession, and with various other papers which required the signature of the queen. He was immediately received by Elizabeth, who, after inquiring after his health with unwonted graciousness of manner,[1] asked if the lord admiral had not desired him to bring her the warrant for the execution of the Queen of Scots. Davison replied in the affirmative, and placed the paper before her, which, after reading over, she called for pen and ink and deliberately signed. She then asked Davison whether he was not heartily sorry to see it done. He replied that he was sorry for the misfortunes of any one, more especially of a princess so nearly allied to her majesty, but that he regarded her death as an act of justice and necessity. Elizabeth listened with a smiling countenance, and desired him to carry the warrant at once to the lord chancellor to have it sealed; and she added that this should be done as secretly as possible, as it might prove dangerous to herself if it were publicly known before the execution took place. She further desired him, on his way to the lord chancellor, to acquaint Walsingham, who was at his house in London, with what had been done, adding that she feared the news would kill him outright.[2] That Elizabeth should have discoursed with such unbecoming levity on the subject of Mary's death—and to the man, too, whose ruin she must by this time have deliberately planned—admits

1. "Her highness first demanding of me whether I had been abroad that morning, advising me to use it oftener, and reprimanding me for the neglect thereof, with other like gracious speeches arguing care of my health," &c.—Nicolas's Life of Davison; Appendix, 234.

2 "The grief thereof would go near (as she merrily said) to kill him outright."—Life of W. Davison, by Sir Harris Nicolas; Appendix 235.

of no excuse; but we must not on that account conclude, as many have done, that she regarded the approaching fate of her cousin with cordial satisfaction. Notwithstanding the careless tone which she assumed in her dialogue with Davison, we have every reason to believe that she was still tortured with doubts and fears as to the consequences of the act to which she had at length assented.

As Davison was about to take his leave, she told him that she wished the execution to be performed as secretly as possible, and indicated the hall of the Castle of Fotheringay as the best place for the purpose. She then, after some slight hesitation, complained of the remissness of Sir Amias Paulet, who, she said, might have "eased her of this burden."[1] It was not yet too late, she significantly added; and she desired that Davison and Walsingham should write immediately to Paulet and Drury, to sound them on the subject. Davison understood her meaning perfectly, for it appears she had thrown out similar hints before, and he at once informed her that he did not believe that Mary's keepers could be induced to put her to death without lawful warrant. But Elizabeth insisted that the attempt should be made; and, after consulting first with Burghley, and then with Walsingham, the following letter, composed by the secretary,[2] was sent off by a special messenger to Fotheringay:—

[1] Sir H. Nicolas's Life of Davison; Appendix, 273.

[2] Ibid., 274. Sir Harris Nicolas suspects that Walsingham stayed away from Court at this time under pretence of sickness, knowing that Elizabeth had now made up her mind to sacrifice the Queen of Scots, and believing that she would seek to throw the blame on some one of her ministers.

"To Sir Amias Paulet.—After our hearty commendations, we find by speech lately uttered by her majesty that she doth note in you both a lack of that care and zeal of her service that she looked for at your hands, in that you have not in all this time, of yourselves, without other provocation, found out some way to shorten the life of that queen, considering the great peril she is subject unto hourly so long as the said queen shall live. Wherein, besides a kind of lack of love towards her, she noteth greatly that you have not care of your own particular safeties, or rather of the preservation of religion, and the public good and prosperity of your country, that reason and policy commandeth, especially having so good a warrant and ground for the satisfaction of your conscience towards God, and the discharge of your credit and reputation towards the world, as the oath of association which you both have so solemnly taken and vowed, and especially the matter wherewith she standeth charged being so clearly and manifestly proved against her. And therefore she taketh it most unkindly towards her, that men professing that love towards her that you do should in any kind of sort, for lack of the discharge of your duties, cast the burden upon her, knowing as you do her indisposition to shed blood, especially of one of that sex and quality, and so near to her in blood, as the said queen is. These respects, we find, do greatly trouble her majesty, who, we assure you, has sundry times protested that if the regard of this danger of her good subjects and faithful servants did not more move her than her own peril, she would never be drawn to assent to the shedding of her blood. We thought it very meet to acquaint you with these

speeches lately passed from her majesty, referring the same to your good judgments; and so we commend you to the protection of the Almighty.—Your most assured friends,

"FRANCIS WALSINGHAM.
"WILLIAM DAVISON.

"At *London, Feb.* 1, 1586-7."[1]

This letter reached Fotheringay on the afternoon of the 2d of February, and Paulet returned an answer on the same day, in which he refused, in very emphatic terms, to comply with the injunctions of Elizabeth. He deeply regretted, he said, to have lived to see the day when he was required, by direction of his sovereign, "to do an act which God and the law forbade." He added that he would "never make so foul a shipwreck of his conscience, or leave so great a blot on his posterity, as to shed blood without law or warrant." Paulet has been much praised by historians because he refused, at the bidding of Elizabeth and her secretaries, to assassinate his prisoner. His prudence was no doubt to be commended; for if he had fallen into the snare, we may conclude, from the subsequent treatment of Davison, that a similar, or perhaps a still worse, fate would have awaited him. His letter, which could not have been despatched until the night of the 2d, did not reach London till the 4th of February, and it was not communicated to Elizabeth until the following day, which was Sunday. She was extremely indignant at his refusal; and pacing uneasily about her room, gave vent to her rage and disappointment by assailing Paulet in the bitterest terms. He

[1] Nicolas's Life of Davison, 86.

was no longer her "loving Amias," but one of those "dainty and precise fellows" who would promise everything and perform nothing. Nay, more, he was a perjurer; for had he not subscribed the bond of association, by which he obliged himself, at the hazard of his life, to serve his queen? She further boasted to Davison that she could have done without him, and named one Wingfield, who, she said, was willing to do what she required.[1] Davison attempted to persuade her that it was much better that everything should be done according to law. She said there were wiser men than he of another opinion, alluding apparently to Leicester and Gray. She also, on another occasion, spoke in the most eulogistic terms of Archibald Douglas; from which we may probably infer that he too was an advocate of the assassination scheme, which, owing to the obstinacy of Paulet, it was now necessary to abandon.

Burghley meanwhile had obtained possession of the warrant. It was duly signed by the queen and sealed with the Great Seal; yet he could not but remember that his mistress had twice signed and twice cancelled the warrant for the execution of the Duke of Norfolk. Burghley was also aware of her correspondence with Paulet, and that if he complied with her wishes no warrant would be required. But, like Davison, he must have anticipated a refusal on the part of Paulet, and this might induce the queen to change her mind. He accordingly determined to act as if no such correspondence had taken place. On Friday the 3d of February he summoned his colleagues together, and having laid before them the warrant for Mary's execu-

[1] Nicolas's Life of Davison, 276. Who Wingfield was does not appear.

tion, informed them that as their mistress had now done all that the law required, it was simply their duty to obey her orders without troubling her further in the matter. He likewise suggested that in an affair of such importance all the members of the Council should unite in sharing the responsibility of the act, in case any question should afterwards arise respecting it. Burghley's proposals received the unanimous assent of his colleagues, and it was determined that Beale, the clerk of the Council, should carry the warrant to the Earls of Kent and Shrewsbury, who were appointed to see it executed.

On the next day after the arrival of Paulet's letter refusing to put Mary privately to death, Beale was accordingly sent off with the warrant to the residence of the Earl of Kent;[1] and on the day following, which was Sunday, he arrived at Fotheringay and communicated the grateful tidings to Paulet. Notice of the intended execution was now sent to Shrewsbury, who was residing in the neighbourhood, and whose office of earl marshal rendered him on the occasion the most fitting representative of the Crown; and on the morning of the 7th of February, the two noblemen arrived at Fotheringay. The frequent arrivals and departures during the few previous days had alarmed Mary's attendants, and the appearance of the two earls, each accompanied by a numerous retinue, confirmed their worst fears. Mary was suffering at the time from one of her periodical attacks of rheumatism, and was in

[1] The letter to the Earl of Kent was signed by Burghley and the Earls of Derby and Leicester, the lord admiral, Lords Hunsdon and Cobham, Sir Francis Knollys, Sir Christopher Hatton, Sir Francis Walsingham, and Davison.—Nicolas's Life of Davison, 96.

bed when she received a message from Shrewsbury and Kent requesting an immediate audience. She rose and prepared to receive them; and anticipating the announcement they had to make, she desired her attendants to remain as witnesses of the interview. Shrewsbury and Kent then made their appearance, followed by the sheriff of the county and by Beale, who, by desire of the two earls, read aloud the commission issued by the Council for her execution. She listened with a tranquil countenance[1] until Beale had finished reading. She then declared that she was well content to leave a world where she was no longer of any use, and where she had suffered so much affliction. She had ever earnestly desired the love and friendship of the Queen of England. She had warned her of coming dangers, and had long cherished the wish that she might for once meet her in person and speak with her in confidence, being well assured that had such a meeting taken place there would have been an end of all jealousies between them. But they had been kept asunder by the enemies of both, who by their perverse policy had endangered her sister's crown, and had imprisoned and cruelly slandered, and were now about to murder her. But she knew in truth that she was about to die for her religion, and this was an ample recompense for all her sufferings. "As for the crime with which I am charged," she continued, laying

[1] Mr Froude (xii. 331) says that Mary was "dreadfully agitated" at the intelligence, on the authority of a paper in Teulet (iv. 154) which says, "La Royne d'Ecosse fut faschée et déplaisanté de ces nouvelles," &c. But Jebb, Egerton, Camden, and all other contemporary authorities, describe the singular composure of her deportment on this occasion, which, we may add, entirely accorded with her demeanour during the remaining hours of her life.

her hand upon a Testament which lay before her, "I am wholly ignorant. I solemnly declare that I never instigated or approved of any conspiracy against the life of the Queen of England."[1]

"That is a Popish Testament," interrupted the Earl of Kent, a furious fanatic, who had on that account apparently been selected by Burghley to witness the death of the Scottish queen; "an oath taken upon that Testament is worthless as the book itself." "It is," said Mary, "according to my belief, the true Testament. Would you, my lord, give more credit to my oath if I swore upon your version, in which I do not believe?" Kent replied by desiring her to renounce her superstition, and he added that the Dean of Peterborough was in the castle, and that she should be permitted to avail herself of his services. This offer Mary at once declined, and earnestly requested instead that her almoner might be allowed to attend her. As might have been anticipated from the language and conduct of Kent, she received a peremptory refusal. She then inquired when she was to die. Shrewsbury replied that the hour fixed was eight o'clock next morning. Having made this announcement, the two noblemen took their leave.

Every circumstance attending the execution of the Queen of Scots was marked with unnecessary barbarity. After months of suspense, she was finally summoned to the block at a few hours' notice. It was evidently the purpose of Burghley to hurry on the preparations for her death, lest his mistress should change her mind; and the admirers of that minister will seek to justify the indecent haste on the ground

[1] Jebb, ii. 612. [2] Ibid.

of State expediency. But why was Mary refused in her last moments the consolations of her religion? We have seen that, some weeks before,[1] Elizabeth had expressly desired that she should be allowed to avail herself of the services of her almoner. We must therefore assume that Paulet had taken upon himself to disregard the orders he had received. He knew that Mary, being now cut off from all communication with the outer world, had no means of complaining of his conduct to Elizabeth; and he probably consoled himself with the reflection that in this instance disobedience to his mistress was obedience to his religion.

Surrounded by her weeping attendants, Mary now entreated them to cease their lamentations, for there was much to be done in the few short hours of life that still remained to her. At supper, which she desired to be served earlier than usual, she drank to them all in turn, and expressed a fervent hope that they would remain constant in their religion and live in peace together. She afterwards divided amongst them all the money which the rapacity of her keepers had left her. She distributed among her women her jewels and her wardrobe, reserving only for herself the dress in which she intended to appear upon the scaffold. She then wrote out her will, entirely in her own hand, describing with minute care a variety of legacies and memorials which she desired to be given to her relatives and servants.[2]

In the course of the night she had a conversation with one of her French attendants named Gorion,[3] in which, as he was about to proceed to Spain, she

[1] *Ante*, p. 441. [2] See Labanoff, vi. 485. It occupies six pages.
[3] Her apothecary; see Teulet, v. 500.

desired him to inform the king that she died true to her creed, and that she earnestly recommended to his favour and protection those of her attendants and friends who through all her misfortunes had served her with unchanging zeal and affection. She especially named Jane Kennedy, and Elizabeth Curle and her brother Gilbert,[1] who had so long acted as her secretary. She also recommended to Philip, on account of their faithful services, James Beaton the Archbishop of Glasgow, and the Bishop of Ross; and she expressed an earnest hope that he would continue the pensions he had allowed to the English refugees who had fled to France and Spain—namely, to the Earl of Westmoreland, Lord Paget, Charles Paget, Charles Arundel, Thomas Throgmorton, Thomas Morgan, and Ralph Liggons.[2]

Having enumerated her friends, she did not hesitate to acquaint Gorion with the names of her chief enemies. She bade him tell Philip, that if he ever again became King of England, to remember the treatment she had received from Burghley, Leicester, Walsingham, Huntingdon, Paulet, and Wade. While enumerating her enemies in England, Mary exhibited an unparalleled instance of feminine forbearance and generosity in omitting the name of Elizabeth.[3]

Before retiring to rest, she wrote a short letter to the King of France informing him that she was to be executed next morning for a crime of which she was wholly innocent; and that, although her almoner was

[1] It would appear from this that Mary was ignorant of the alleged confession of Curle in the Star Chamber.

[2] Teulet, v. 503.

[3] Ibid., 504. The omission is very remarkable.

residing under the same roof, she was not allowed to see him. She entreated Henry to take her servants under his protection, and to pray for the soul of a queen "who once was styled Most Christian, and who was about to die in the true faith, deprived of all she once possessed."[1] It was two in the morning when she finished writing, and her physician now prevailed on her to take some rest. She retired for some hours, her women watching and weeping by her side; but they observed that she slept but little, and that her lips occasionally moved, as if in prayer. Before day-break she desired Jane Kennedy to read to her from one of her favourite books, 'The Lives of the Saints.'[2] She then prepared with more than ordinary care for the last scene of her life. The dress which she had reserved for the occasion was of rich black satin,[3] and she wore a long white veil of crape reaching to the ground. After her toilet was completed, she retired to her oratory and remained at her devotions until, at the appointed hour, the sheriff was announced. She then rose from her knees, and simply said, "Let us go."

Being unable, from the weakness of her limbs, to walk without assistance, she was supported by two of her servants until she reached the outer door of her apartments, when their place was taken by two of Paulet's retainers. "It is the last trouble I shall give you," she said, cheerfully taking the proffered arm of each, and, preceded by the sheriff and the two earls, she moved slowly towards the hall. Before they reached it, Sir Andrew Melvill, who had been allowed to be present on the occasion, made his appearance,

[1] Labanoff, vi. 492. [2] Jebb, ii. 631. [3] Teulet, iv. 150.

and throwing himself on his knees before the queen, burst into tears, lamenting that it should have fallen to his lot to carry to Scotland the tidings of her death. "Weep not, good Melvill," she replied, "but rather rejoice that an end has come at last to the sorrows of Mary Stewart; for know that all this world is but vanity. And this message I pray you bear from me, that I die a true woman to my religion, and a true woman to Scotland and to France.[1] But God forgive them that have long desired my end, and have thirsted for my blood as the hart thirsteth for the water-brooks. O God!" she continued, "who art the Author of all truth—and truth itself—Thou knowest the inmost recesses of my heart, and how that I was ever willing that England and Scotland should be united. Commend me to my son. Tell him that I have done nothing to prejudice his rights as King of Scotland. And now, good Melvill, fare thee well."[2] So saying, she kissed him, and then proceeded on her way.

Before reaching the great hall, she requested Kent that he would allow her women to be present at her death; but this he flatly refused, saying that the company would be disturbed by their cries and lamentations, and that they might even be guilty of the superstitious folly of dipping their handkerchiefs in her blood. Mary replied that she would pledge her word they would do nothing of the kind. But Kent still remained obdurate, upon which Mary said she could not believe that his mistress would sanction such treatment even of a far meaner person. "You know," she continued, "that I am the cousin of your

[1] Harleian MSS., 290. [2] Ibid.

queen, descended like her from the blood of Henry VII., a married Queen of France, and an anointed Queen of Scotland. Surely, my lord, you cannot deny me this my last request. My poor girls only wish to see me die." Shrewsbury appears to have now interfered; for after consulting together, the two earls informed her that she might choose two of her ladies and four of her male attendants to accompany her to the scaffold. Of the former she selected Jane Kennedy and Elizabeth Curle: and of the latter, Burgoin, her physician; Gorion, her apothecary; Gervais, her surgeon; and Didier, her butler.[1]

She was now led to the scaffold, a platform about two feet high and covered with black cloth which had been erected in the centre of the hall. It was surrounded by guards; and although the gates of the castle were closed, some two hundred persons assembled to witness the execution, consisting of various gentlemen of the county, and the retainers of Shrewsbury and Kent. The tranquil and composed demeanour of the Scottish queen filled the spectators with surprise. Having taken the seat prepared for her, Beale, the clerk of the Council, proceeded to read aloud the commission for her execution, to which she listened as if it had in no way concerned her.[2]

[1] Ellis, iii. 114. Among her four male attendants Tytler names her "almoner" as one—see vol. viii. 355; but this is a mistake. It is certain that she was not allowed to see him at this time.—See her letter to him the night before her execution; Labanoff, vi. 483.

[2] "During the reading of which commission the Queen of Scots was silent, listening unto it with as small regard as if it had not concerned her at all, and with as cheerful a countenance as if it had been a pardon from her majesty for her life;" Ellis, iii. 113.—From a report of the manner of the execution of the Queen of Scots sent to Lord Burghley. In the account in Teulet, she is described as "regardant toute l'assemblée d'une joyeuse contenance."—Teulet, iv. 157.

After Beale had finished reading, she said aloud, in the hearing of all present, that although a sovereign princess, she had been wrongfully imprisoned, and wrongfully charged with crimes of which before this company she now most solemnly declared that she was innocent. Being about to die, she would accuse no one; but she felt assured and consoled with the reflection, that after she was gone much would be brought to light that now was hid, and that the objects of those who had so eagerly sought her death would one day be disclosed.[1]

Shrewsbury, now addressing her, said, "Madam, you know what is to be done." She replied simply, "Do your duty," and was about to leave her seat when Dr Fletcher, the Protestant Dean of Peterborough, appeared upon the scaffold.

It is hardly credible that even in this age a dignitary of the Anglican Church and a nobleman of the highest rank should have persistently insulted a dying woman at her devotions. Yet such was the undoubted fact. Although she again and again informed the dean that, being resolved to die in the faith in which she had lived, she must decline his services, he addressed her in a long and elaborate harangue,[2] expatiating on her crimes and on the virtues of Elizabeth, and exhorting her to abandon her religion and adopt his while there was yet time for repentance. Observing that Mary, instead of listening to the dean, was absorbed in her own thoughts, and occasionally kissed a crucifix[3] which she carried in her hand, Kent ex-

[1] Jebb, ii. 636; and Tytler, viii. 356.

[2] It is given at full length in Strype, Annals, iii., Appendix.

[3] It was sent by her desire to the Earl of Arundel, and is now in the possession of Mr Howard of Corby Castle.

claimed, "You had better, madam, leave such Popish trumperies and carry Christ in your heart." Shrewsbury, more reasonable than his colleague, proposed that as Mary declined to listen to the exhortations of the dean, they should join with her in prayer. "My lords," she said, "if you will pray for me I shall be thankful for your prayers; but I cannot join with you in prayer, for your religion is not mine."[1]

She then fell on her knees and prayed aloud in Latin, while the dean and the two earls prayed in English, accompanied by many of the spectators. At length they ceased, while Mary continued at her devotions, and every other sound was hushed. She now, in the hearing of all present, prayed in English for the welfare of the Church, for Queen Elizabeth, for her son the King of Scots, and for all her enemies.[2] When she ceased, the executioner and his assistant approached her; but she said with a smile that she was not used to such attendants, nor to undress before so large a company. She then called her two ladies, who in vain attempted to restrain their grief. Mary, placing her finger on her lips, said that she had pledged her word for them. With their assistance she then put off her robe, and appeared attired from head to foot in crimson.[3] The executioner now begged her forgiveness upon his knees. "I forgive every one," was her reply;

[1] Ellis, iii. 115. [2] Jebb, ii. 638; Camden, 536.

[3] "Son cotillon estoit de velours rouge, et le corps estoit de satin rouge, et estant despouillé jusques à ce cotillon, l'une de ces demoiselles luy aiant apparté une paire de manches de satin rouge, laquelle elle mist en ses bras; et ainsy fut exécuté tout en rouge."—From a contemporary narrative in Teulet, iv. 160. There is at Blairs College, Aberdeenshire, a contemporary portrait of Queen Mary which contains in the background a representation of the execution. In it she appears attired in crimson only to the waist.

and kneeling at the block with a handkerchief bound round her eyes, she said several times aloud, "Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit." Kent and Dr Fletcher had beheld the scene unmoved, but it was otherwise with the executioner. Distracted by the audible sobs of the spectators, he missed his aim, and struck her a wavering and uncertain blow on the back part of the head. It probably rendered her insensible, for she remained unmoved; and after two additional strokes her head rolled on the scaffold. He then held it up, disfigured as it was, in the view of all present, and cried out in the usual form, "God save the queen." The Dean of Peterborough shouted, "So perish all the queen's enemies!"[1] The Earl of Kent alone replied, "Amen."[2] Shrewsbury shed tears[3] in silence, and the rest of the spectators were lost in pity and admiration.

[1] "Then Mr Dean said with a loud voice, 'So perish all the queen's enemies!'"—Ellis, iii. 117.

[2] "Ouy dit le Comte de Kent, á haut voix, et d'un grand courage, 'Amen, Amen.'"—Teulet, iv. 161.

[3] "Le Comte de Cherosbery et plusieurs autres furent remarqués avoir répandu des larmes."—Ibid.

CHAPTER XXVI.

RESULTS OF MARY'S DEATH.

THE minds of the people had been carefully prepared for the execution of the Queen of Scots by the circulation of rumours of the most alarming kind. It was given out that her son was busily preparing for war, that the Duke of Guise had actually landed on the south coast at the head of an invading army, and that she herself had made her escape from Fotheringay.[1] When, therefore, the news of her death reached London, the church bells tolled still more merrily, and the bonfires blazed still brighter, than when the sentence pronounced against her had been publicly proclaimed. It would perhaps be unjust, under all the circumstances, to accuse the citizens of inhumanity for indulging in these demonstrations, for they only expressed a natural

[1] On the 4th of February, four days before Mary's execution, the Mayor of Exeter received the following significant notice: "These are to charge you in her majesty's name, upon death, to make diligent search and hue and cry everyway for the Queen of Scots, who is fled, and to lay all highways and stay all barks and shipping in your harbours. So you keep a standing watch day and night until you receive order to the contrary," &c.—Thomas Ward, Constable of Honiton. See Ellis's Letters, 2d series, vol. iii. 108. See also a letter from the Mayor of Exeter, dated Saturday the 4th February, stating that he had received intelligence that London had been set on fire, and that he had caused "men and armour accordingly to be in readiness."—Wright, ii. 330.

sense of relief from dangers which they had been artfully taught to believe were of the most imminent and appalling kind, and which had now passed entirely away.

But the tidings of Mary's death brought no relief to the anxious mind of Elizabeth. She knew well that violent remedies, although sometimes successful, were always dangerous; and she received the news with mingled feelings of apprehension and remorse. Then followed a succession of scenes far surpassing in violence anything in her previous history. After an outburst of grief which astonished and alarmed her attendants, she declared that she had been deceived by her ministers, and that although she had signed the warrant, she never intended it to be executed. Walsingham, under the pretext of illness, kept discreetly aloof from Court; but Burghley and Davison were both at Greenwich, and against both she was, or seemed to be, incensed to a degree of fury which they had never previously witnessed. She drove the lord treasurer from her presence with a volley of abuse, and she accused the secretary of disobeying her orders and violating his duty on a matter of supreme importance. Burghley, as was his wont on such occasions, resorted to his pen for consolation;[1] and Davison, who had the misfortune to be far too honest for his office, and who had faithfully obeyed the orders of the queen in causing the warrant to be executed, was deliberately sacrificed to the supposed exigencies of the hour. As Elizabeth now pretended that Mary

[1] See in Strype (Annals, iii., Appendix) a long series of proverbs, some in English, some in Latin, and some in Greek, which he wrote out on the occasion.

had been put to death not only without her sanction, but against her express orders, she sought to convince the world of her sincerity by consigning to ruin and disgrace the man she had employed to effect her purpose. She acted in strict accordance with the rules of political morality both preached and practised in the sixteenth century; but probably not a single human being was deceived by all this parade of hypocrisy and treachery.

We have seen that Burghley had himself proposed, before the warrant was despatched, that all the members of the Council should share the responsibility of Mary's death. But in spite of this solemn engagement, the lord treasurer and his colleagues basely abandoned Davison to the vengeance of the queen. It was in vain that he declared that he had faithfully obeyed her orders. She knew that there were no witnesses to their conversation. She charged him with falsehood and disobedience; and he was condemned by the Star Chamber to be imprisoned and to pay an enormous fine,[1] which entailed upon him pecuniary ruin as well as political extinction. Never during the fifteen remaining years of her reign did Elizabeth relent or exhibit a trace of compunction for the sufferings of the man whom she thus cruelly sacrificed, in the vain hope of imposing upon the world. The most zealous and faithful of all the ministers she ever possessed remained in obscurity and disgrace till the day of her death.[2]

[1] Howell, i. 1229. He was tried for misprision and contempt.

[2] That James was fully persuaded of Davison's innocence, we may assume from the fact that he received him into favour after he succeeded to the English crown.

"It reflects much honour on James," says Sir Harris Nicolas, "that he should have surmounted the prejudice which he must have naturally

The passionate grief displayed by Elizabeth on the death of Mary has been very generally ascribed to pure hypocrisy; but there is good reason for believing that much of the emotion which she exhibited was genuine, and that she was in reality deeply moved by the last act of the long-anticipated yet ever-dreaded tragedy. We cannot doubt that the struggle, which ended in her final resolution to take her rival's life, had been long and painful; and now that the deed was done, it was impossible that she could be blind to the infamy which it was sure to entail, or to the dangers which it was likely to provoke. The execution of Mary was a mortal challenge, not only to Scotland and to France, but to the whole of Catholic Europe. Gray, indeed, had assured Elizabeth that James would upon no account break the peace; but the Kings of Scotland were rarely masters of their subjects, and how would the nobility and people brook this unparalleled national affront? The King of France, too, although at the time sorely beset by his two enemies, Henry of Guise and Henry of Navarre, had displayed much more energy on behalf of his sister-in-law than could have been expected from his previous conduct. He was, moreover, highly incensed at the utterly groundless charges made against his ambassador, and still more at the imprisonment of Destrappes—a proceeding which, even if he had been proved to be guilty, was a gross breach of the law of nations. Henry, in retaliation, laid an

felt against one accused, and even convicted, of causing his mother's death, by allowing himself to be persuaded of his innocence; and by thus serving him, he testified to the world that such was his view of Davison's case."—Life of Davison, 199.

embargo on British shipping, and sent a special envoy to London to demand redress.[1] As for the King of Spain, he was still busily employed in equipping his fleets and collecting his levies for the invasion of England; and the execution of the Queen of Scots not only led him to accelerate his preparations, but induced a host of volunteers from all parts of Europe to flock to the standard of the Prince of Parma, in the hope of sharing in the glory of the crusade which that renowned commander was about to lead against the inveterate enemy of their religion and the incessant disturber of the world's peace.[2]

In this menacing aspect of affairs it was of the first importance to conciliate the King of Scots. Elizabeth accordingly addressed him in an autograph letter, which she intrusted to her cousin Robert Carey,[3]

[1] Mignet, ii. 246, and authorities there cited.

[2] Ibid., 234; De Thou, 89; Strada, lib. ix.

[3] A son of Lord Hunsdon. The following was the letter addressed by Elizabeth to the King of Scots:—

"My dear Brother,—I would you knew, though not felt, the extreme dolour that overwhelmeth my mind for that miserable accident, which, far contrary to my meaning, hath befallen. I have sent this kinsman of mine, whom ere now it hath pleased you to favour, to instruct you truly of that which is too irksome for my pen to tell you. I beseech you, that as God and many me know how innocent I am in this case, so you will believe me, that if I had done it I would have abode by it. I am not so base-minded that the fear of any living creature should make me afraid to do what is just; I am not so degenerate, nor carry so vile a mind. But as not to disguise fits most a king, so will I never dissemble my actions, but cause them show as I mean them. Thus assure yourself from me that as I know it was deserved, if I had meant it, I would never over another's shoulders, and to impute to myself that which I did not so much as think of: I will not. The circumstances you will be pleased to hear of this bearer; and for my part, think you have not in the world a more loving kinswoman, and more dear friend, nor any that will watch more carefully to preserve you and your State; and if any would otherwise persuade you, think they bear more goodwill to others than to

and in which she solemnly disavowed all participation in his mother's death. She described that event as a miserable accident, and she expressed the deepest sympathy with James in his misfortune and the most devoted attachment to his person. These representations deceived no one; and to avenge Mary's death, the Borderers, who had ever been partisans of his mother, soon afterwards broke into the northern counties at various points,[1] and after inflicting a vast amount of damage, attacked the Warden of the Middle Marches, Sir Cuthbert Collingwood, in his Castle of Eslington, from which, to avoid capture, he was compelled to make a precipitate retreat. At any other time Elizabeth would have exacted prompt and ample reparation for these affronts, but the dread of an alliance between James and the Spanish king induced her to dissemble; and Walsingham addressed to the former a long and very able despatch,[2] in which he pointed out all the benefits, both immediate and prospective, of the treaty he had recently concluded with England, and the dangers which were likely to ensue in the event of his joining the Catholic Powers. James[3] perceived his advantage,

you. Thus in haste I leave to trouble you, beseeching God to send you a long reign."—Printed in Rapin, b. xvii.

[1] "The Scots Borderers have made great incursions in England, for repressing whereof the Lord of Hunsdon is expected shortly with forces. The king winketh at the matter."—Courcelles' Negotiations, vii. 50. See also Tytler, ix. 8, and Border correspondence there cited.

[2] The letter is printed in Spottiswoode, 359 *et seq.*

[3] It is difficult to believe that James was sincerely desirous of saving his mother when he employed her worst enemy, the Master of Gray, to intercede for her. It is said that he exhibited much emotion when he heard of her death.—See Lord Scrope to Walsingham; Wright, ii. 333. But Calderwood says, "When the king heard of the execution he could not conceal his inward joy, howbeit outwardly he seemed sorrowful.

and resolved to make the most of it. The execution of his mother furnished him with a just cause of war; and with no real intention of coming to a final rupture with Elizabeth, he might, by assuming a menacing attitude, extort from her much more favourable conditions than those of the preceding year. No definite reply, therefore, was returned to Walsingham's despatch: but the principal nobility still continued clamorous for war; and Lord Maxwell, the most powerful of the Border chiefs, repaired to the Court of Philip, and was expected by his friends to reappear very speedily with a Spanish squadron in the Solway.[1] It was at this period of general excitement and expectation that the Master of Gray was brought to trial for his crimes. His accuser was Sir William Stewart, the brother of the Earl of Arran, who had fallen a victim to his intrigues; and he was specially charged with having instigated the ministers of Elizabeth to put the king's mother to death. Gray defended himself with his accustomed audacity and skill, but he was convicted and sentenced to die as a traitor. On the intercession of Lord Claud Hamilton, his life was spared, and he was allowed to retire to France. He

. . . He said that night to some few that were beside him, 'I am now sole king.'"—Calderwood, iv. 611. Although exaggerated, there is probably some truth in this description.

[1] Lord Maxwell was expected to arrive at Kirkcudbright with a Spanish force, which was to take part in the invasion of England.—Courcelles' Negotiations, 78.

Speaking of the demeanour of the nobility at a Parliament held this summer, Courcelles says: "As for the revenge of his (the king's) mother's death, they swore and protested they would be always ready to bestow life and goods in that quarrel, and fight in it as long as any drop of blood rested in their bodies; and if he (the king) would forthwith command them to take arms and invade England, they would verify their protestations by effects."—June 6, 1587; Courcelles, 70.

now abandoned his Protestant friends; for we soon afterwards find him engaged in fresh intrigues on behalf of his early patrons, the Spanish ambassador and the Duke of Guise.[1]

Elizabeth had been assured by her ministers that she could only hope for security and peace by consenting to Mary's death. But never were predictions more completely falsified, for at no period of her career did she find herself in a situation more critical and alarming than after that event. She knew that, in spite of the flatteries of her courtiers, she was execrated as a murderess throughout the greater part of Europe; and on whichever side she turned, she was confronted by dangers which she was compelled to meet, but all of which she could hardly hope to overcome. In addition to the hostile attitude of the Kings of France and Spain, Ireland was once more in rebellion; and could she venture to count in case of need upon the loyalty of her Catholic subjects, whom she had so long and cruelly persecuted? In Scotland there was now a powerful Spanish faction, headed by Huntly, Crawford, and Maxwell, who did not fail to represent to the king that he would never have so fair an opportunity of avenging his mother's death as by joining Philip in his great enterprise. But James entertained a shrewd suspicion that in case Philip did succeed in annexing England to his dominions, he would not only keep his conquest to himself, but perhaps deprive him of his own realm of Scotland. It is probable, therefore, that he never seriously entertained the overtures of Philip; although, to alarm Elizabeth, he listened to them with apparent approval. Eventually, after a vast amount

[1] Occurrences out of Scotland; Record Office, January 1587-88.

of double-dealing upon both sides, she offered, and he agreed to accept, as compensation for his mother's death, a fresh pension and an English duchy.[1] But it is satisfactory to know that he never obtained either the one or the other; for after the danger of a Spanish invasion had passed away, she found abundance of pretexts for evading the performance of her promise.[2]

With the King of France, Elizabeth had a less difficult part to play. Although Henry was sincerely desirous of avenging both Mary's death and the affront to his ambassador, his dread on the one hand of the growing power of the Duke of Guise, and on the other of the Protestant heir of his house, the indomitable Henry of Navarre, who after a hundred defeats was still as confident as ever of ultimate success, compelled him to pause before he ventured on an open rupture with England. But his mother, Catherine, regarded the death of Mary with absolute indifference, if not with satisfaction; and through her influence he was finally induced not only to leave it unavenged, but to accept the ample apologies of Elizabeth for the treatment of his ambassador and the imprisonment of Destrappes.[3]

With Spain the relations of Elizabeth had always been on an anomalous footing, and after Mary's death they became more strangely complicated than ever. Within two months of that event, Drake set out on one of his marauding expeditions; and after destroying an immense amount of shipping and military stores

[1] William Ashley to Burghley, 6th August 1588; Record Office.
[2] Fowler to Walsingham, 29th December; ibid.
[3] Mignet, ii. 250.

at Cadiz and Lisbon, returned to England laden with plunder. But although he had sailed with the sanction of the queen—for several of her ships took part in the expedition—she gave him but a cold reception; for she was now immersed in negotiations with the States of Holland on the one hand, and with Philip and the Prince of Parma on the other. Ambassadors from the Dutch Republic were beseeching her to aid them with more men and money, to enable them to continue the deadly struggle in which they had embarked; while the Spanish king and his lieutenant professed their anxious wish for peace at almost any price. Elizabeth treated the only allies upon whom at this time she could depend with boisterous rudeness or insolent condescension, while to the insidious overtures of their enemies she listened with unmixed delight. Nothing is more certain than that Philip and Parma only sought to amuse the English queen and her ministers by the peace negotiations which were now commenced. Although the slowest, Philip was the most obstinate of men, and the invasion of England was a thing upon which his mind had long been irrevocably fixed. He only sought to deceive Elizabeth as to his true intentions; and he entirely succeeded. Burghley was equally the dupe of the Spanish king, for he gave entire credit to his professions of amity and peace. It is surprising that the lord treasurer and his mistress should have been so thoroughly deluded by arts which they themselves had so long and so systematically practised. But such was the undoubted fact. Although for twenty years they had given Philip every conceivable kind of provocation, they seemingly thought to turn him from his schemes of vengeance by sud-

dently professing for him the warmest friendship.[1] While this diplomatic farce was going on, they wilfully shut their eyes to the vast preparations which in Spain and Portugal, as well as in Italy and Belgium, were being made for the culminating effort of Philip's life.

Elizabeth's advisers were not all equally blind to the coming danger. Walsingham and Leicester never believed in the pacific professions of the Spanish king,[2] and the Lord Admiral Howard did not hesitate to denounce with a sailor's frankness the inconceivable credulity of Burghley. "Since England was England," he said, "there never was such a stratagem and mask to deceive her as this treaty of peace. I pray God that we do not curse for this *a long grey beard with a white head, witless.* You know whom I mean.[3]" Howard was evidently of opinion that the vessel of the State required for its guidance in the coming storm a clearer head and a firmer hand than those of the old lord treasurer; and fortunately for England, there were in the hour of peril men fit to take the helm. But they were neither diplomatists nor ministers of State.

During the progress of these negotiations Leicester resumed his command in the Netherlands; but his military incapacity, and his imperious, irascible, and revengeful temper, soon became more conspicuous than ever. He had no sympathy for the people he was sent to govern. He affected to despise them as traders and mechanics, and they saw plainly that he was neither

[1] For a detailed account of these negotiations see Motley, ii. chap. xviii.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Howard to Walsingham, quoted by Motley from Record Office, 26th January 1588; Motley, United Netherlands, ii. 425.

wise in council nor fit to cope with Parma in the field. It was not possible, under these circumstances, that he could long maintain his post; and after a few months of mutual recrimination, he took his final leave of the Netherlands, cordially detested by the inhabitants, and no less cordially detesting them in turn.[1]

Philip had now matured his plans. By the middle of April 1588, an army of 60,000 men had assembled in the Netherlands; and at Newport, Sluys, and Dunkirk, Parma had collected transports sufficient for the conveyance of his invading force across the Channel. In another month the mightiest naval armament that the world had ever seen sailed from the Tagus, and yet Elizabeth and Burghley continued to believe in peace. She was still employed in bullying the deputies from the States, and in bandying compliments with Parma; while the lord treasurer was pottering over interminable protocols which Philip's astute lieutenant was busily exchanging with the queen's representatives at Ostend, where from week to week they confidently expected the peace negotiations to be concluded.[2]

After the Armada sailed it was driven back by foul weather to the Spanish coast, and Elizabeth's ministers assumed that no further attempt would be made for at least another year. Even Walsingham shared in this delusion. But Howard and Drake were of a different opinion, and so was Sir John Norris, who, with other officers who had served with distinction in the Netherlands, never ceased to urge upon the queen the necessity of taking effective measures for the

[1] Motley, United Netherlands, ii. chap. xviii.
[2] Ibid., vol. ii. chap. xix. 438, 439.

defence of her dominions. But it was not until the Spanish fleet was descried off the coast of Devonshire, on the 20th of July,[1] that all doubts as to the reality of the invasion were removed. It carried on board an army of some 20,000 men; and so meagre had been the preparations for defence, that they probably might have been landed without any serious opposition. But the Spanish admiral, Medina Sidonia, had strict orders to steer direct for Calais roads. He was there to await the arrival of the Prince of Parma, who, protected by the fleet, was to transport his invading army across the Channel. As he had no fortresses to take, and no standing army to oppose him, he calculated that with 30,000 of his best troops he should be able to make his way to London with comparatively little loss.

To oppose the finest army and the first commander in the world, Leicester was despatched to Tilbury, where some[2] thousands of hastily-collected levies had been assembled. But they were half-fed, half-armed, and wholly undisciplined; and no one, excepting the vainglorious earl himself—who immediately on his arrival began, as was his custom, to quarrel with his officers—anticipated, with such materials, an easy victory over the veterans of Parma. Fortunately for the reputation of the queen's favourite, and for the queen herself, no opportunity was afforded him of acquiring in England that military distinction which in the Netherlands he had sought in vain.

[1] Old style, which is maintained throughout, unless the contrary is stated.

[2] On the 26th of July, the day before the Armada reached Calais, only 4000 men had arrived at Tilbury, and they were unprovided both with beef and beer.—Motley, ii. 490.

To Lord Hunsdon was intrusted the defence of London; and in the hour of danger nothing could exceed the energy and enthusiasm of the people. While the queen was complaining bitterly of the cost of her soldiers and her sailors, and in spite of the remonstrances and entreaties of their commanders stinting their supplies even of arms and ammunition, the most liberal contributions of both were made by private individuals. The merchants and traders of the seaport towns fitted out innumerable armed vessels at their own cost, which, although no match for the great war-ships of Spain, rendered essential service in the coming struggle. The plan of the English commanders was to avoid a general engagement with the Spanish fleet, which, as compared with their own, was of overwhelming strength. But they trusted that their superior seamanship, and their perfect knowledge of the Channel and its currents, would enable them to attack and destroy their enemy in detail; and these wise tactics proved successful even beyond their expectations.

The Armada reached its destination in Calais roads on the 27th of July. The English fleet, led by Howard, Drake, the veteran Hawkins, and Martin Frobisher, had, for a week, followed closely in its track, engaging in a series of desultory fights with detached portions of the squadron. In these encounters the English were invariably successful; but the critical moment, upon which the fate of the expedition, and perhaps of England, depended, had now arrived. It was in Calais roads that Parma with his invading army was to join the Spanish fleet. But a contingency of which Philip had never dreamed proved

fatal to all his calculations. He had taught the Hollanders to fight on the water as well as on the land; and Flushing, Newport, Sluys, and Dunkirk were at this time all closely blockaded by their fleets. Parma's transports were fully prepared for the reception of his troops; but in the face of such an enemy it would have been madness to put to sea: and hemmed in on every side, he was forced to abandon all immediate hope of joining the Armada, and to await in helpless inactivity the progress of events.

Perceiving the dilemma in which the Spanish admiral was placed, the English commanders now promptly determined to act on the offensive. They could not venture upon a pitched engagement with an enemy so vastly their superior, but they resorted to a stratagem which had the effect of placing them more on a footing of equality. About midnight on Sunday the 28th of July, the Spaniards descried, to their horror and amazement, a number of fire-ships drifting towards them in the darkness. The wind, which was blowing from the south-west, threatened to carry these engines of destruction right into their midst; and remembering the fire-ships of Antwerp which had been sent against Parma's bridge, they were seized with an uncontrollable panic,[1] and immediately put to sea in the utmost disorder. They were forthwith assailed at great disadvantage by the English, who, throughout the night, inflicted upon them a vast amount of damage. Then followed a succession of storms, very unusual at that season of the year, which carried both fleets to the northwards; and after several days' continued fighting, in which the Spaniards suffered terri-

[1] Motley, ii. 466 *et seq.*

bly, as well from the enemy as from the tempestuous weather, they finally abandoned their project of invading England. But as the Channel was now literally swarming with English and Dutch cruisers, they preferred to sail round the north of Scotland on their homeward voyage to a renewal of the struggle. They were hotly pursued as far as the Firth of Forth, where the English commanders were reluctantly forced to abandon the chase for the want both of provisions and ammunition. It was after all danger had passed away, and the remnant of the Spanish fleet was in full retreat towards the Orkneys, that Elizabeth paid her celebrated visit to Tilbury. She is there said to have commended the valour and patriotism of her troops,[1] which, in fact, they had had no opportunity of displaying; but at this very time her sailors, who had fought her battles with a courage and a constancy that was never surpassed, were perishing of hunger. "'Tis a most pitiful sight," said the lord admiral, "to see here, at Margate, how the men, having no place where they can be received, die in the streets. I am driven of force myself to come on land to see them bestowed in some lodgings; and the best I can get is barns and such outhouses, and the relief is small that I can provide for them here. *It would grieve any man's heart to see men that have served so valiantly die so miserably.*[2]

[1] It seems very questionable whether Elizabeth ever made any such harangue as that attributed to her.—See Lingard, vi. 252, note.

[2] Howard to the Privy Council, 22d August; quoted by Motley from the Record Office, ii. 497. Burghley seems to have encouraged the queen in her ill-timed parsimony. In a memorial dated the 12th of August, when the fate of the Armada was still undecided, we find him laying down such axioms as the following: "To continue charges without need-

Thus ended the mighty enterprise of Philip. If it had succeeded, it was doubtless his intention to have claimed the crown of England as the Catholic heir of Mary Stewart; and all Catholic Europe would have hailed the overthrow of Elizabeth as an act of righteous retribution. But her astonishing good fortune did not desert her at this the most momentous crisis in her history. The mischievous activity of her ministers had brought her into a position of tremendous peril. She was saved by the friendly interposition of the elements in her behalf; by the extraordinary skill and daring of her sailors, whom she allowed to starve; and by the fidelity and vigilance of her Dutch allies, whom she had all along been ready to abandon and betray.

Elizabeth gained much in reputation from the circumstance that the most powerful monarchs of the age, her rivals in policy and in religion, were in no way conspicuous for their abilities or their virtues. It must be admitted that, with all her defects, the Protestant queen contrasted favourably with the remorseless bigot of the Escurial and the painted puppet of the Louvre. She had indeed enjoyed advantages which Philip and Henry had never known. Not only had she been nurtured in adversity, but her excellent natural talents had been cultivated and improved by an exceptionally excellent education. Among her many accomplishments, she had acquired in high perfection the art without which Tiberius declared that no monarch was fit to reign; for even her most ardent

ful cause bringeth repentance;" "to hold on charges without knowledge of the certainty thereof, and of means how to support them, is lack of wisdom," &c.—Motley, ii. 496.

admirers must now admit that Elizabeth imposed more successfully upon mankind than any equally conspicuous personage of history. In the eyes of the multitude in her own day, and in those of many historians since, she was a great and magnanimous sovereign—the idol of her people and the terror of her enemies. In reality it is easy to perceive, through all her cleverness and cunning, that she was not only the vainest and the meanest, but the most irresolute and vacillating of her sex. Her capricious and tyrannical treatment of her ministers and attendants, the domineering tone which she could assume with so much effect towards foreign ambassadors, and her occasional sallies of coarse wit, were all to ordinary observers so many proofs of her high and courageous spirit. They in reality veiled, though they could not conceal, a radical weakness in her nature, which is abundantly perceptible throughout her whole career. The incredible amount of irresolution which she displayed on every great emergency, and the startling inconsistencies of her policy and conduct, admit of no other explanation; nor is it too much to say, that the greatest crimes which stain her memory were committed under the influence of terror. When the insatiable spirit of vengeance which she displayed after the bloodless rising of 1569 alarmed her best friends; when she allowed her soldiers to die of hunger in the Netherlands, with the deliberate intention of betraying to Philip the people she had sworn to protect; when she would have had her Council invent some new kind of tortures, more horrible still than the law allowed, to be employed in the punishment of Babington and his companions; when, after a ceaseless struggle of nineteen years, she was

finally induced to consent to the murder of Mary Stewart, and when she perfidiously sought to transfer the guilt of the deed to the minister who had faithfully obeyed her orders,—we must, in charity, assume that she was the slave of her womanish fears. As her powers of intellect became impaired, the weaknesses inherent in her nature became more and more apparent; and there is nothing in all history more painfully tragic than the closing scenes of Elizabeth's life. To the very end she was haunted by imaginary terrors,[1] until she died, at last, the most fortunate of sovereigns, but the most broken-hearted and the most unlovable of women.

[1] It is well known that Elizabeth lay on the floor of her chamber for several days and nights before her death, positively refusing, though entreated by her attendants, to return to her bed. If they had seen, she told them, what she had seen there, they would not have asked her to go back to bed. She appears to have remained in this state for two days and three nights.—Narrative of Mrs Southwell, cited by Lingard vi. 316, note.

CHAPTER XXVII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

THE history of Mary Stewart has left so indelible a stain upon that both of England and Scotland, that we need not be surprised to find a majority of the writers of both countries agreed in representing her as the victim of her own misconduct. Although it is natural to sympathise with misfortune, national pride and religious prejudice are sentiments far stronger; and nothing could be more humiliating to both than the reflection that an innocent woman had undergone a course of persecution to which all similar examples of State iniquity are but as dust in the balance. But there are three English historians of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries respectively, who have arrived at this conclusion, and who, in point of research and accuracy, are certainly unequalled by any of their contemporaries. These are Camden, Carte, and Lingard, whose opinions have been rarely referred to in these volumes, as it has been my intention throughout to investigate the charges against the Queen of Scots as they have been presented by her enemies, and to test

them chiefly by the evidence which they have supplied.[1]

[1] The following are the remarks of Carte, a historian now too little read, on the character and fate of Mary Stewart: "It is the fate of some princes to be ruined by their virtues; her clemency was abused and returned with the vilest ingratitude; her religion served as a pretence to all the insurrections that disturbed her reign, and proved at last the cause of her death; her honest, open, unsuspecting nature drew her to put confidence in Murray and other ministers that employed their power and credit for her destruction. In France, where she was educated and married very young, the exemplariness of her conduct, the decorum of her Court, the piety of her sentiments, the regularity of her devotions, the liveliness of her conversation, the justness which appeared in all that she said and did, rendered her the delight and admiration of that nation. Removing to Scotland, a country overrun with factions of the nobility grown to a mighty head during a long minority, and filled with a commonalty soured by the furious spirit of Knox and his fellow-preachers, ever ready to mutiny and rise in arms on pretence of religion, she became exposed to all the diabolical calumnies which the most profligate of mortals could raise against her for their own interest, and fell into a series of troubles, which, forcing her to take refuge in England, were the occasion of her long imprisonment and cruel death in this country. The patience, the constancy, the firmness with which she endured all the hardships and indignities put upon her during her captivity, cannot be sufficiently admired; the Christian manner of her death was not unworthy of the best of men; and the intrepidity with which she met the king of terrors, the genuine effect of innocence, was not surpassed by any of the heroes of antiquity."—Carte, b. xix. 619. Another distinguished Englishman of the last century expressed himself much in the same terms. In Boswell's Journal of a Tour in the Hebrides, the following conversation is described as having taken place in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh: "I here," says Boswell, "began to indulge old Scottish sentiments, and to express a warm regret 'that by our union with England we were no more an independent kingdom.' 'Sir,' said Johnson, 'never talk of your independency, who could let your queen remain twenty years in captivity, and then be put to death, *without even a pretence of justice*, without your ever attempting to rescue her; and such a queen, too, as every man of any gallantry of spirit would have sacrificed his life for.' Worthy Mr James Kerr, Keeper of the Records, said, 'Half of our nation was bribed by English money.' 'Sir,' said Johnson, 'that is no defence. That makes you worse.'"—Journal, 33. It is not generally known that John Wesley expressed a similar opinion. From a passage in his Journal, dated April 1768, it appears that he had been reading on the subject, and was convinced of Mary's innocence.

The conclusion at which these historians have arrived is strongly corroborated by a very important authority, the late Mr Markham J. Thorpe, who was employed of recent years by the Master of the Rolls to peruse and arrange the vast collection of letters and papers relating to the Queen of Scots contained in the Record Office. After examining and arranging all these documents, he expressed himself as follows: "The evidence they contain is all-important; there is abundance of insinuation, there is much assertion of guilt, *but proof nowhere*, so far as the compiler has been able to seek it."[1]

These same documents, which must fail to convince every impartial inquirer of Mary's guilt, contain abundant evidence of the criminal conduct of her accusers; for of the innumerable fraudulent devices practised for her destruction by Murray, Morton, and Maitland in Scotland, and by Burghley, Leicester, and Walsingham in England, we have overwhelming proofs. Forgery was a recognised weapon of diplomacy in the sixteenth century; and we can place no more reliance on

"But how then," he says, "can we account for the quite contrary story which has been almost universally received? Most easily. It was penned in French, English, and Latin (by Queen Elizabeth's order) by George Buchanan, who was secretary to Murray and in Queen Elizabeth's pay; so he was sure to throw dirt enough. Nor was she at liberty to answer for herself. But what, then, was Queen Elizabeth? As just and merciful as Nero, and as good a Christian as Mahomet."—See Tyerman's Life of Wesley, iii. 32. The only mistake he makes is supposing that Bothwell was near seventy at the time of his marriage with the queen.

[1] Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland, Preface, 26. The testimony of this gentleman is of the highest value, as it was his duty to examine in detail every document in the collection, including what he justly calls "the monstrous letters" said to have been written by the queen to Bothwell.

the ciphers of Gifford and Philipps than on the contents of Murray's famous casket.

Those historians who maintain that the Scottish queen was the victim, like so many of her ancestors, of her turbulent and treacherous nobility, have a comparatively easy task to perform; but those who have adopted what may be called the popular view of the question, have an obvious difficulty in presenting to their readers an intelligible notion of her character and conduct. The caricatures of Knox and Buchanan have at least the merit of consistency. They deny her the possession of a single virtue, and they accuse her of every crime. But these extravagant creations have given place to others still more extravagant. The favourite fashion at present seems to be to paint her at once as the worst of criminals and the most estimable of her sex. Kindly, yet cruel—constant in her attachments, yet treacherous and fickle—generous and confiding, yet perfidious alike in planning and remorseless in executing her schemes of vengeance,—Mary Stewart has been presented to modern readers as a paragon of contradiction, resembling nothing else in history or even in fiction.

In this estimate of the character of the Scottish queen, Hume, the ablest and the most indulgent, and Mr Froude, the most recent and most reckless of her modern adversaries, seem to agree. "The most amiable of women"[1] is an expression which slips, as it were, involuntarily from the pen of Hume when summing up the qualities of Mary. Mr Froude, although he denounces her as the worst and most abandoned of her sex, and in language unprecedented among his-

[1] Chap. xlii.

torians of any age,[1] nevertheless informs his readers that she was "warm[2] and true in her friendships;" that she had "a noble nature;" and that she was "generous"[3] in the extreme. It is difficult to see what more could be said even by the most devoted of her admirers.

But there seems to be an unaccountable confusion of ideas in the notion thus presented of the character and qualities of this celebrated queen. We can well understand that a person of an amiable, constant, noble, and generous nature, might, under the impulse of some strong and sudden provocation, be induced to commit a great crime. But that is not the charge against Mary Stewart. She is accused of a murder requiring in its execution not only the greatest deliberation, but the most consummate deceit. She is accused of feigning the tenderest affection for the husband she abhorred, that she might lure him to the snare prepared for him by his assassins. To assert that any human being, possessed of the high moral qualities attributed by her modern adversaries to Mary Stewart, could have been guilty of such monstrous wickedness, is an absurdity which refutes itself.

Yet Mr Froude seeks, apparently, to reconcile the existence of all these virtues with all this depravity. By quoting two or three unfriendly remarks from Spanish envoys, the motive for which has been sufficiently explained[4]—by accepting as authentic the

[1] See vol. ix. 44, where he compares her to "a brute." Yet in the very next sentence he speaks of "her noble nature."

[2] Vol. viii. 191, note. [3] Vol. ix. 250.

[4] The refusal of the Queen of Scots to sign the Catholic league.

letters produced at Westminster — by accepting as genuine the "depositions" of Paris, which even Buchanan rejected, although they bear his name as an attesting witness — by accepting as genuine the fictions of the 'Detection,' and even of occasionally inventing fictions of his own,[1]—Mr Froude has made out, to all appearance, a very strong case against the Queen of Scots. But how to reconcile all this wickedness with the noble and amiable qualities which he attributes to the royal criminal, is a problem which he leaves his readers to solve for themselves.

Mr Burton has another theory as to the supposed guilt of the Scottish queen. "Mary," he says, "was evidently one of those to whom at that time a great affair of the heart was a necessity of life."[2] But why at that time? Mary had lived for upwards of four years of widowhood in France and in Scotland, and although constantly surrounded by watchful and hos-

[1] Of this, one notable instance has been given. It is well known to every one acquainted with the history of the controversy, that one of the most suspicious circumstances connected with the alleged letters of the queen to Bothwell is the absolute silence of her enemies at the time of the pretended discovery. Mr Froude gets over the difficulty by boldly asserting, not only that the confederate lords were surprised and indignant beyond measure at the finding of the letters, but that they forthwith sent off one of their number to acquaint Murray, who was then in Paris, with the fact, and to urge him to return to Scotland. For all these details, so circumstantially narrated, not a vestige of authority is given (*ante*, vol. i. 352). See also the speech put into the queen's mouth at the time when she was intercepted by Bothwell, for which no authority is given (*ante*, vol. i. 307). See other instances referred to in the present volume, p. 258 and 263. With respect to Mr Froude's general treatment of the subject, the reader is referred to three very able articles by Professor Wiesener of Paris, in the 'Revue des Questions historiques' for April, July, and October 1868; and also to the preface to the second edition of the recent work of Mr Alexander M'Neel Caird, 'Mary Stuart, her Guilt or Innocence.'

[2] Vol. iv. 324.

tile eyes, without reproach of any kind.[1] This is a most important fact to be considered in estimating her character and disposition, and one which is too generally lost sight of. It may be admitted, notwithstanding, that if her marriage with Bothwell was a purely voluntary act, the presumption of guilt would be strong against her; but we have shown that the stories circulated at the time respecting her infatuated attachment to that personage[2] rest either upon hearsay or on the authority of notorious enemies. We have shown that they are contradicted by the indisputable evidence which we possess of her actual conduct both before and after her marriage. Her earnest desire to return to France after Darnley's death—a fact which we learn from the Spanish ambassador in Paris, at that time an unfriendly witness; the precarious state of her health as described by Drury, another hostile witness; her miserable condition on her wedding-day, as witnessed by Du Croc; and the still more conclusive fact that she parted from Bothwell within a month afterwards, and against his wish,—are circumstances wholly incompatible with that absorbing pas-

[1] The insinuations regarding Chatelar to be found in Knox were circulated long after the event.

[2] We have no contemporary description of Bothwell except from Brantôme, who describes him as "le plus laid homme et d'aussi mauvaise grace qui se pût voir" (Des Dames illustres, disc. iii.) Lord Hailes observes upon this picture, "As far as I can judge, Brantôme never saw Bothwell" (Remarks on the History of Scotland, 167). It is surprising that a writer so careful as Lord Hailes should have thus attempted to impugn the testimony of Brantôme. It is well known that that lively writer accompanied Mary to Scotland, and Bothwell was present at the first Privy Council which she held in Edinburgh—namely, on the 13th October 1561 (see Keith, ii. 104). But it is most probable that Brantôme had seen Bothwell in France long before that time.

sion with which her enemies assert she was possessed. And when we consider who these enemies were, and the overwhelming interest they had in transferring the suspicion of the king's murder from themselves to Bothwell and to her—when we consider the unfathomable craft of Murray, the unrivalled subtlety of Maitland, and the cynical contempt of all morality habitually displayed by Morton,—we need not be surprised at their success. That the true object of the marriage—namely, the ruin of Bothwell and the queen—was suspected even before it took place, we know from Drury;[1] and when we look at the formidable array of names appended to the "Ainslie" bond,[2] it is impossible to see how she could have avoided the snare prepared with such consummate art for her destruction. A temporary retreat to France, to which she instinctively looked[3] amid the unknown perils to which she was exposed, could alone have saved her; but the implacable jealousy of the queen-mother cut off her only chance of safety.

The same lawless oligarchy which had sought, while she was in France, to deprive her of her crown—which had done its utmost to prevent her return to Scotland—which had risen in rebellion against her after her marriage with Darnley—which had plotted her destruction at the time of Riccio's murder,—at length accomplished her ruin by forcing her to marry Bothwell. And when we consider the singular forbearance which she displayed on all occasions, we are tempted to conclude that, like the foremost man of all the ancient world, whom in the magnanimity of

[1] *Ante*, vol. i. 321.
[2] Vol. i., Appendix K.
[3] Letter of Frances de Alava, 15th March 1567; Teulet, v. 22.

her nature she certainly resembled, she fell at last, through her extreme indulgence to her vanquished enemies. If Elizabeth had been in her place, can we for a moment doubt what would have been the fate of Murray and Chatelherault, of Morton and Glencairn?

Yet in the darkest hours of her existence, even when she hailed the prospect of a scaffold as a blessed relief from her protracted sufferings, she never once expressed a doubt as to the verdict that would be finally pronounced between her and her enemies. "The theatre of the world," she reminded her judges at Fotheringay, "is wider than the realm of England." She appealed from her persecutors to the whole human race, and she has not appealed in vain. In regions uninhabited or unknown when she uttered these words—on the ice-bound shores of the Baltic, in the busy cities of the Far West—the story of her life creates as deep an interest as in the capitals of Europe; and so long as beauty and intellect, a kindly spirit in prosperity and matchless heroism in misfortune, attract the sympathies of men, this illustrious victim of sectarian violence and barbarous statecraft will ever occupy the most prominent place in the annals of her sex.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A.

COTTON MS.; Caligula, c. i. fo. 198.

[This letter has been slightly singed on the outer margin. The letters or words which are thus burnt away are here placed within brackets. The words printed in *italics* are very carefully erased with the pen, and in some instances are disguised with head and tail loops, to prevent their being read; the alterations being written between the lines. The marginal marks (ꝏ) seem to have been made by Sir Robert Cotton.]

PLEASITHE it your most excellent Matie to vnderstand, that sithens our last depeche the Earle of Murraye, and his Colleagues, to occupie the time, haue put in their answeare to the Complainte exhibited by their aduerse partie. the Copie of wch answeare we send herewith to your Matie. And albeit they haue in the same touched nothinge plainely of the cause of the Murder, wherevpon they staye and suspend th[eir] proceadinge, vntill they may be resolved in their Articles proponed vnto vs, wch we sent in our last Lres to your Matie, yet the said Earle hath byne content privately [to] shew vs suche matteir as they haue to condempne the Q. of Scottes of the murd[er] of her husband, to the intent they wolde know of vs how your Matie, vnderstandinge t[he] same, wolde iudge of the sufficiencie of the matteir, and wheither, in your

Ma^ites opini[on], the same will extend to condempne the Q. of Scottes of the said murder. And so they sent vnto vs the L. of Lethingtoñ, Jhames Makgill, Mr George Boqwhanno[n] and one other beinge a L. of the Session, wch in private and secreate conference with vs, not as Commyssioners, as they protested, but for our better instructioñ, afte[r] declaratioñ of such circumstaunces as led and induced them to vehement presumptio[n] to iudge her giltie of the said murder, shewed vnto vs a Copie of a Bande, bear[inge] date the xixth of Aprill 1567, to the wch the most parte of the Lordes and Counsail[le] of Scotland haue put to their handes, and, as they saye, more for feare then anie lykinge they had of the same: wch Bande conteyned ij speciall poinctes. the one [a] declaration of Botheilles purgation of the murder of the L. Darley, and the othe[r] a generall consent to his mariage with the Q., so farre forthe as the Lawe [and] her owne likinge shoulde allowe. And yet, in proufe that they did it not will[inglie], they procured a warraunt, wch was now shewed vnto vs, bearinge date the 19. [of] Aprill, signed with their Q. hand, whereby she gaue them licence to agree to th[e] same, affirminge that, before they had suche warraunt, theare was none of them [who] did, or wolde set to their hand, savinge only the Earle of Huntley. Theare was also, in the Copie of the Bande, a Copie of a warraunt, folowinge much to th[at] effect, savinge that the one did licence to do, and the other semed to discharge and pardon that was done: wch bare date the .14. of Maye. It appeared also, [on] the selfe same daye of the date of this Bande, being the .19. of Aprill, the Ea[rle] of Huntley was restored by Parliament. W^ch Parliament was the occasioñ th[at] so manie LL. weare theare assembled: wch beinge all invited to a Supper by Bothaill, weare induced after supper, more for feare then otherwise, to subscrib[e] to the said Band, two hundred harkebusiers beinge in the Courte, and abowt the Chamber doore wheare they supped, wch weare all at Bothailles devotioñi; wh[ich] the said LL. so muche misliked that, the next morninge by foure of the Clocke, fe[w] or none of them weare lefte in the Towne, but departed w^thovt takinge their leave. Theare was also a

a secret declarat. of the matt^r ag. the Q. of Scottes.[1]

[1] This side-note is in Cecil's hand.

Contracte shewed vnto vs, signed wth the Q. han[d] and also wth Bothailles, bearinge date the .5. of Aprill, written, as it is sai[d], with the Earle of Huntleyes owne hand, who wth one Thomas Heborne weare the only witnesses to the same; wch Contracte bearithe date before Bothaille[s] purgatiõ of the murder, whereof he was not tried nor pourged before the .12. of Aprill folowinge, and also before the Processe of divorce begonne betwen[e] Bothaill and his wief, wch was not begonne before the first of May, and y[et] with speede ended w^th^in eight daies, and the vngodlie mariage betwene [the] Q. and him, solempnized the .15. of Maye after. And also, the .15. of Junie folowinge, the Q. her selfe was taken by her Nobilitie. The counterfeicte and coulorable takinge of the Q. by Bothayll, when he carried her to Dumbar, was the .24. of Aprill, after the deathe of her husband, who was murdered the .10. of Februarie ~~last before~~ 1567. Theare was also a Con-

Quenes

tract shewed vnto vs, of the ~~Earles~~. owne hand, of the mariage to be had betwene her and Bothaill, bearinge no date, wch had not Verba de presenti, as the other had bearinge date the 5. of Aprill. It appeared also vnto vs, by two Lres of her owne hand, that it was by her owne practize and consent that Bothaill should take her, and carry her to Dumbar, of pollicie, as the L. of Lethingtoñ told vs, because els theare coulde be no devise in Lawe to pardon his fowle facte of the murder, affirminge that, by the Lawes of that Realme, a pardoñ for great Offences includethe all lesser factes, and offences, but extendithe to none greater then that wch is pardoned. And therefore, except he shoulde commit the highest offence, wch is treasoñ, as he did in layinge violent handes upon his Sovereigne, no pardon coulde serve to excuse him of the murder. And havinge his pardon for the Treason, it suffisethe also for the murder; a fitte pollicie for a detestable facte. After the devise of the murder was determined, as it semed

they inferred upon

by the sequeale, *it appearithe vnto vs, by* a Lre of her owne hand, that theare was another meane, of a more cleanely conveyance, devised to kill the kinge. For theare was a quarrell made betwixte him and the L. Robt. of Holie Rood howse, by

carryinge of false tales betwixte them, the Q. beinge the instrument, as they saide, to bringe it to passe: wch purpose, if it had taken effect, (as it was verie likely, for the one givinge the lye to the other, they weare at daggers drawinge) it had eased them of the prosecutiõ of the devilishe fact; wch, this takinge none effect, was afterwardes most tirannously executed. Afterwardes they shewed vnto vs one horrible and longe Lr̃e of her owne hand, as they saye, conteyninge foule matteir and abhominable to be either thowght of, or to be written by a Prince, with divers fonde Ballades of her owne hand; wch Lr̃es, Ballades, and other writinges before specified, weare closed in a litle Coffer of silver and gilte, heretofore geaven by her to Bothaill. The said Lr̃es and Ballades do discover suche inordinate *and filthie* love betwene her and Bothaill, her loothesomnes and abhorringe of her husband that was murdered, *and the conspiracie of his deathe*, in suche sorte as every good and godlie man can not but detest and abhorre the same. And theis men here do constantly affirme the said Lr̃es, and other writinges wch they produce, of her owne hand, to be of her owne hand in dede; and do offer to sweare and take their othe therevpon. *as in dede* the matteir conteyned in them beinge suche as coulde hardely be invented or devised by anie other then by her selfe; for that they discourse of some thinges wch weare vnknowen to anie other, then to her selfe, and Bothaill *dothe the rather perswade vs to beleive that they be in dede of her owne hand writinge.* And as it is harde to counterfeite so manie, *and so longe Lr̃es*, so the matteir of them, and the manner how theis men came by them, is suche, as it semethe that god (in whose sight murder and bludshed of the innocent is abhominable) wolde not permitte the same to be hidde or concealed. In a paper here inclosed we have noted to your Matie the cheif and speciall poinctes of the said Lr̃es, written (as they saye) wth her owne hand, to the intent it may please your Matie to consider of them, and so to iudge wheither the same be sufficient to convince her of the detestable crime of the murder of her husband; wch in our opinions and Consciences, if the said Lr̃es be written with her owne hand, *as we beleiue they be*, is very *plaine and manifest.*

hard to be avoyded

Most humbly beseachinge your Matie, that it may please the same to aduertize vs of your opinion, and iudgement therein, and to direct vs with suche speade, as to your highnes shalbe thowght convenient, how w[e] shall proceade further in this great matteir. And so for the more expedico[us] sendinge this blotted Lr̃e to your Matie (whereof we crave pardoñ) we besech almightie god to preserve your most excellent Matie in good healthe and longe lief, most prousperously to Reigne over vs. From your Maties Citie of Yorke the xjth of October 1568.

Your Ma^ites most humble, faithfull̃ and obedient Subiectes

T. NORFFOLKE

T. SUSSEX

R. SADLER

Address: To the Quenes most excellent Matie

Endorsed by Cecil; partially effaced. The D. of Norfolk etc. to the Q. [Ma^t]^y w^t the Er. of Murrays answ^r and an abstract of matters [ag.] the Q. of Scottes.

APPENDIX B.

No. 1.

(From the Scots College in Paris, dcciphered by the late Dr Kyle.)

Memoire de ce que le SEIGNEUR RODOLPHI a faict entendre a la Royne.

Que sa majesté face rompre la conference d'Angleterre le plutost que faire se pourra, en cas que l'on ne faict rien apres deux audiences, et fault escrire à la Royne d'Angleterre, que puisque elle ne veult autrement, sa majesté est contente de demourer tousjours entre ses mains, et que elle donne congé à ses ambassadeurs. Cependant il faut avertir le duc et ses amys par deça quilz avisent à prendre quelque autre chemin, comme deja ilz sont resolus de faire.

Que sa Sainteté promet tout ayde possible, et de autent melieure volonté que sa majesté conjoint tousjours la religion avec l'estat, priant qu'elle continue tousjours.

Sa Sainteté a mandé au sudict, qu'en cas que sa majesté ne peult sortir par apointement de prison, deja sa Sainteté a apointé avec le Roy d'Espagne en sorte qu'il fera tout ce que Rodolphi luy mandera.

Si l'apointement ne s'acheve, il fault escrire à tous ses amys en ce reaulme quilz ayent à ecrire ensemblement avec elle au Pape, a l'Empereur, aux Roys de France, et Espagne, comment sa majesté est indingnement traicté, et fault que le messagier soit à l'election des dicts amys, qu'il soit agreable aux princes, fidel a sa majesté, bien voulu des seyngneurs de ce pays, et surtout qu'il puyse negocier sans soubsone. (Seipsum nominat tacite.)

Il fault remonstrer au Roy de France que la guerre par deça sera la paix en France, et que tout ce que les Huguenaults ont faict, á ésté á l'instigation des Angloys, qui travailent encore, plus que jamays, pour derechef semer quelque

sedicion novelle, et qu'il n'y a meilieur moyen pour empechre leurs dessengs, que de leur doner des affayres à la maison.

Que s'il playst au Roy de France envoyer des hommes, le Pape contribuera à les suldoyer.

Que si le Roy de France ne veult ayder, à cause de trubles non encor bien apaysees, l'Empereur le fara sitost qu'il entendra la volonté de sa majesté et ses amys pardeça, par le moyen sudict.

Qu'il se fayct fort de porter au Roy de France la et promise de tous les amys de sa majesté pardeça, en cas qu'il s'excuse, qu'il ne seayt à qui se fier, ni avec qui joindre ses forces, ni de qui esperer assistance en Escosse, ou en Angleterre.

Que si le Roy de France vouloyt interdire le traific aux Angloys et Escossoys, come les Roys d'Espagne et Portugal ont faict, on en auroyt la raison bientost sans coup fraper.

Hæc Rodolphus eo animo mihi dixit ut Reginæ communicarem, et deinde at te scriberem, ut et Nuntius Apostolicus eadem intelligat, quod et Regina probavit.

Au reste, la Royne vous pry de remonstrer au Nunce combien le mariage de Monsieur avec la Royne d'Angleterre seroit au prejudice, tant de la religion Catholique, que de son droyt, à fin qu'il s'employe à le rompre.

6 Feb. 1571.

La Royne m'a commandé vous dire que le Conte de Sussex a assuré E que Morton sera pour nous, moyenent son perdon.

La Royne me dict qu'elle pense bien qu'il ayt des lettres pour son service aux cofres de feu mon frere; pour à quoy satisfayre, j'ay escrit et ay faict escrire, au nom de la Royne, au doyen de Glasgo, qu'il ayt à sciler les cofres, jusques à ce que moy, ou autre, au nom de la Royne les viene visiter.

Opinor id propter lapidem, quem scis, dictum. Regina putat eum ex hereditate Cardinalis patrui esse. Ego nolui laborare suspitione. Interea Betoun graviter fert se vel nominatam fuisse in testamento.

La Royne a escrit pour vostre pasport, et a remis la resolution de vostre voyage, jusques à ce qu'elle ayt la response; alors je solicitere.

Jussit Regina ut te certiorem facerem Ducem Norfolcium

credere tibi non probari nuptias; rogatque ut cum Ligons ea de re agas, scribasque per eundem, non ad Rossonsem, sed ad ipsum Ducem, ut intelligat te non esse alio animo quam ut here imperata facias; rogandumque ne tam facile in posterum calumniatoribus aurem praebeat. 9 Feb. 1571.

[The above is anonymous. On the outside it has, in cipher, De Betoun. This paper appears to contain the substance of a communication made by Ridolphi to the Queen of Scots. It was probably drawn up by her secretary, Raulet.]

No. 2.

Bishop Leslie of Ross to Archbishop Beaton.

Encore que nous soyons icy en traicte si sommes nous incertains quel succes en suyvra. Car il y [a] ordinairement des pratiques inventees pour nous troubler, ce que sommes deliberez d'obvier le mieux que nous pourrons; et pour ce en toutes avantures, les lieutenans de sa majesté, et autres de ses bons et fidelles subjectz, ont envoyez icy pour nous donner amples information des troubles de l'estat du pays, et pour le remede. Qui sont Jacques Bruce pour les Contes d'Argyll, Archeveque de St André et Sieur de Fleming, Guillaume Lesely, frere du Conte de Rothes, et Jehan Schilsome pour les Contes de Huntly, Athol, Sieurs de Lethington et Grange. Le dict Bruz s'en retournera deux jours par expres commande de sa majesté et notre advis, bien informé en toutes choses. Guillaume Lesely vous sera envoyé sitost que nous trouverons quelque poinct de consequence se presenter de notre traicte. Tout leur credit ne tend qu'a telle fin: Qu'il ne sont deliberez de rien refuser de ce qui leur est possible pour obtenir la liberte de sa dicte majesté, en consideration de la nonchalance d'autres princes à les secourir, mesmement se presentent eux memes pour pleigeiz, encore qu'ilz n'ayent envie d'abandonner l'ancienne alliance de France. Si ceste Royne d'Angleterre voioit autre chose proceder du Roy que parolles et lettres, elle adoulciroit les conditions qui sont bien

dures. Et pour ce qu'ilz voyent que malaisement le Roy vouldroit entrer en guerre ouverte avec elle, ilz ont trouvé cest expedient, comme en Escosse ilz pourront estre aisement supportez sans luy donner grand ennuy et trouble. Car s'il plaisoit a sa dicte majesté d'avancer seulement cinquante mil escutz, pour l'entretenement de deux mils soldatz Escossoys par l'espace de six moys, ou mil pour l'espace d'ung an, pour demeurer a Lisleburg, les dictz lieutenans offrent de demeurer en la ville continuellement avec eux; et le dict Sieur de Granges pour sa part offre, estant asseuré d'ung ayde et secours, pour s'advancer des premiers, de s'en asseurer des Contes de Lenox et Morton, et les arrester prisonniers, ou autrement les traicter pys; et par le moyen des dictes forces, avec l'assistance de leurs amys, ilz seront suffisans se defendre d'Angleterre quelque junction qu'on sauroit faire. Ce propos cy est fort apparent a sortir son effaict s'il plaist au Roy de les ayder. Les Sieurs Evesque de Galloway, Sieur de Levis-ton et moy avons faict cet ouverteure a l'ambassadeur de sa majesté cy resident, et luy avons declarés le credit des dictes gentilzhommes. Il trouve l'ouverteure fort bonne, et a escrit au Roy le tout. La Royne m'a commande aussi de faire vous escrire à telle fin que puissiez insister, s'il est possible, de gaigner ce poinct, et de communiquer le tout a monseigneur le Cardinal de Lorraine, et m'en escrire la response qu'on pourroit esperer en cest endroict, que je puysse asseurer la noblesse d'Escosse, car ilz n'attendent que la responce. Aussi sa majesté est fort offencée que la main levee a este octroiée simplement et sans caution; car encore que la Royne d'Angleterre a fort insisté de l'avoir de sa majesté, elle ne m'a jamais permis luy octroier qu'en ces termes en donnant caution. Jusques a ceste heure que vostre frere est arrivé par commandement de sa dicte majesté, j'ay faict mon proffict le mieux que j'ay peu et ay donné a entendre a la Royne d'Angleterre que tout a été faict pour la gratyfier et a la requeste de nostre maistresse. Sa majesté m'a adverty qu'elle a este informée que c'est Monsr Demorvilliers qui principallement a advancé la dicte main levée, et que pour cela vous en este faché contre lui. Si ainsi est, ce n'estoit pas la deue recompancé a sa majesté pour la benefice qui injustement m'a este

osté, qui n'ay rien et donne a celluy qui en a trop. Nous avons consenty a la Royne d'Angleterre que la dicte main levée ne durera pas jusques au premier jour de Mars, qui est le dernier jour de la prorogation de l'abstinence d'armes; car devant ce jour nous y esperons quelque fin. Je na fay doubte que n'ayez faict advancer d'imprimer le livre [1] que je vous ay envoyé, de quoy je vouldrois bien estre certifie. Semblablement je n'ay rien receu de vous en chiffre ces sept ou huict moys passez, de quoy je mes merveille grandement. S'il y a quelque chose qui vous faire, je serai tres aise de la cognoistre; car je n'ay rien obmis, ne encore pour l'advenir n'obmettray d'en escrire ce qui est requis pour le service de notre dicte maistresse. Vous plaira recevoir de la noblesse d'Escosse de lettres, autres de votre pere. Sa majesté m'a commande d'en escrire a Mr Ninyen Winyet pour la venir trouver et resider pres sa dicte majesté pour son service. Car en l'extremite de sa derniere maladie, on ne pouvoit trouver personne pour luy administrer; en sorte que j'ay supplie ceste faulte comme Dieu m'a donné sa grace; et pour ce je vous prie de l'advancer.

Le vostre asseuré Ross.

En Londres le xviij^me Janvier

[1571 ?]

No. 3.

Secretary Raulet to Archb^p Beaton.

Je vous supplie bailler le double de cest Alphabeth aux deux freres Hamiltons pour interpreter ce que je leur ecry, changeant les caracteres du votre en communs.

ω R F q o w ? o–o ⅄ ξ ε fo n γ +++ δ ⊏ 4 p 9 k f α
o ++ fo 6 τ 8 6 |:| ℒ □ σ 8 γ α r ω 4 ⅃ 3 z ξ 7 p
a b c d e f g h i k l m n o p q r s t u x y z

[1] He alludes, no doubt, to his 'Defence of Queen Mary's Honour.'

Il y a certaines choses en la lettre que sa majeste ecrit a Monsr de Seton, pour luy servir d'instructions ou il doibt aller, de quoy sa majeste n'a voulu que ceux qui dechifrent ses lettres ayent cognoissance; combien qu'elle ne se defie aucunement d'eux, mais l'importance est telle qu'elles ne peuvent estre trop secretes. C'est a voz despens, car il a falu que la dicte lettre soit en votre chifre, et les discours sont ung peu longs. Sa majesté vous a faicte une ample depesche, n'estant asseurée que le peu de liberté qu'elle a luy soit continué. Il n'y a que fraude en toutes les actions de la Royne d'Angleterre. Elle a faict venir Morton jouer tel personnage qu'elle a voulu. Il s'est servi soubz main des nouvelles accusations composées par Magil et Buccanan contre la Royne d'Escosse, et par ce moyen tellement couloré leurs actions qu'ils pretendent avoir gagne le consentement de plusieurs protestans a la mort de sa majeste. La conjuration de laquelle, et la perte de Dunbarton sont les fruits de la negociation de ce traicté du costé de deça; du vostre vous le voyez, et les avez provez de longue main. J'espere que sa majesté ne lairra passer telle occasion sans faire plaincte en ce parlement de cest entreprise et deliberation: car il y a preuves. Pour le moins sera ce une honte a la Royne d'Angleterre. Morton *a cuy de suyvre les arres du bastard;*[1] a sa venue faisant semblant de se vouloir venger a sa majesté, et croyre a ses amys. Mais personne d'eux ne s'y est fye. Il ne trouvera les choses en Escosse disposées selon son humeur: et n'auront ses praticques si grand effect entre les armes (ains que j'espere) qu'elles ont en durant la decevable abstinence. L'on dict deja que tout y est en combustion. Si nos gens sont soustenus quelque peu, j'en ay bonne esperance. La Royne d'Angleterre sera contraincte abandonner les rebelles, qui d'eux mesmes ne peuvent resister, ou y envoyer une armée; et en l'un et en l'autre cas, je ne suis destitué de bonne esperance. M. d'Ogilvy a grandement irrité sa majeste;[1] je ne scay qu'il en reuscira.[2] Je vous diray seulement qu'elle

[1] I have put these words in italics, as they appear to be unintelligible; but they are correctly copied from Dr Kyle's decipher.

[2] Why the Queen was displeased with Lord Ogilvy at this time does not appear.

est si mal edifiée de son ingratitude et desobeissance, qu'il me semble que ce qu'avez ecrit pour luy a este aussi peu agreable a sa majesté que les plainctes qu'il faisoit de vous au commencement. Je m'asseure toutes foys que vostre intention n'est toujours autre qu'en suivre celle de sa majesté, qui est la cause que je vous donne cest advis.

Sa majesté a faict bailler icy cinquante escus a Chesholme, pour aller par dela, et m'a commandé vous escrire que luy faictes bailler ce que verrez estre necessaire davantage, selon la despence qu'il luy conviendra faire.

Sa majesté vous prye qu'il luy soit envoyé quelque argent icy, et que ce soit par la voye de Monsr de la Mothe, qui luy fera tenir. Il y a cinq cens soldatz qui se fortifient en la ville et en l'abbaye, lesquels sa majesté a faict lever, et fault qu'ilz soient entretenus, ou tout laisser perdu. Car s'ils n'ont moyen ilz couperont la gorge aux nostres. Il ne s'est encore rien veu par dela ny de l'argent, ny des armes de Flandres, que sa majesté avoyt ordonner a Monsr de Seton y envoyer.

[*Marked on the back, by Thomas Innes,*

Q, April 1571.]

No. 4.

Secretary Raulet to Archb^p^ Beaton.

Ce mot ou figure Car a deux significations en vostre chifre, l'une pour Montmorency, l'autre pour Seigneur. Vray est q'au myen celluy de Seigneur est ains ꝑ, et le premier ainsi Car. Peutestre jay mis l'une pour l'autre; mais a la despeche de xii de Juing, je croy que soit entendu pour Seigneur, et que tout le propos s'y accommodera. Les minutes sont brulées, et n'ay point souvenance qu'il y a en aucun discours de Monsr de Montmorency. Les chifres, qui ont esté envoyez pour Monsr de Seton, ont tousjours esté marqués ainsi S, ce qui est commun pour ceux qu'il envoye a la Royne, et pour ceux qui luy sont envoyez de sa majesté; et

pour ceux qu'il en estoit allé et venu de semblables parmi voz pacquetz precedentz je ne vous en avoy donne autre. Il vous est envoyé deux chifres pour le soliciteur, (je croy par Chesholme), marqueés ainsi (*W3* ◇—), et ainsi (♈ ◇—), et pour mesme consideration ne vous en donnoy poinct d'autre advis. Il luy estoit lors faict responce a plusieurs de ses lettres, et depuis n'en avons poinct receu de nouvelles. Je prendray la hardiesse mectre icy mes humbles recommendations a sa bonne grace, ne pouvant luy ecrire. Il y a cy ung chifre pour Bothwelhach, marqué ainsi ✠, que je vous supplie luy faire interpreter, et luy conseiller mectre le dechifrement, ensemble de celuy que je luy envoyay avec le token, dans le feu, de peur qu'ils tombent en mauvaise main. Ce n'est de cest heure qu'il vous plaict estre soigneux de mon bien et commodité plus que je ne merite, et me souvient de ce que Monsr de Marmoustier de son propre mouvement vous en dict ung jour, cognoissant que m'estiez bon seigneur et amy, de quoy je luy seray toute ma vie obligé. S'il se presente quelque occasion, cela me rendra d'autant plus hardy a vous employer, et supplyer ramentevoir au dict Sieur de Marmoustier la bonne volonté qu'il luy plaisoit avoir envers moy. Mais pour la sotte habitude que j'ay prise, jusques a cest heure de ne penser poinct a moy, ny a la viellesse qui me vient accuellir, je suis si miserable que je ne scauroy rien demander sinon en faisant, comme j'ay tousjours faict, le peu de service qui est en moy fidelement et de bonne volonté. Je vous recommande mes anquictz que j'envoyay par Chesholme, suivant lesquelz je vous supplye me faire decharger. Quand l'occasion s'offrira, je vouldroy estre si heureux que de vous pouvoir faire service. De Cheefield le xxviij d'Aout. RAULET.

Il y a deux chifres pour Mylord Flaming, marqués de ceste figure ✠, qui doresnavant servira pour son nom, et vous plaira l'adjouster a votre Chifre, et pour Bothwelhach, cestuy-ci ✠.

Marked outside:

Recu le xix Septembre 1571.

No. 5.

MAITLAND of LETHINGTON to ARCHB^P BEATOUN.

Monsieur. Lak of commodity of trusty bearers hes this lang tym stayit me fra wryting you, sair aganis my wil; wherby I was not abil to informe you of the state of materis heir as I wald: quhilk (I dout nocht) hes bein na smal prejudice to the Quenis caus. I have had commodity aneuch to wryte hir majesties self, but neither to you nor Mons. de la Mothe, sen the interception of John Cheisholme, befor now. I onderstand, be her majesties wryt, scho hes sufficiently informit you of that misfortune, as also of the taking and detening of Dumbarton; quhilk put us in a great strait, and the caus in parril of overthrow, if God had not movit us to prevent the danger with diligence, and yet it put us in a very hard cais. It is convenient you knaw the state of Scotland treulie as it is, quhairof you mon mak the best, be uttering or disguising sa mekle as may serve the turne, and maist move the King of France to mak support. Quhatsumever opinion we have had that a great nombre of Scotland favorit the Quene, and mislykit of her enemies, yit be experience we find bot feu that takis the mater to heart. Mony we fand that in privat conference with their friendis wad lament her caus, and be wordis profess that thai wish weil to hir majestie, and semis to mislyk the present governement, but now we have put the mater that point that dead must try quha wil set forward hir caus, and quha not, we find very few quha puts thair hand to the pleuch. Feu wil mel in the caus, or dip ernestly ather to defend hir frendis, or invaid hir enemies. You knawis be the letteris and memoiris send to you in April bygane a yeir, in quhat termis we then stud, and quhat nombre of nobilmen maid sum contenance and demonstration that they wald then set furth the Quenis caus, quhilk company was dispersit til sindry placis, be the incoming of the Englismen in May bygane a yeir; sen quhilk tym, for na labouris culd be maid, that nombre culd never to this hour be assemblit again in a place. From the first day of September last, til a great part

of winter was past, the mater was driven under esperance of the treaty quhilke the Quene of England had in hand, and men had some houp, be hir meanes, it wald be brocht to ane accord. During that tym many gave guid wordis, bot na nombre of nobilmen culd be movit to assemble in a place. Excusis war ay foundit upon the incommodity or onseurty of the roum to meet in; and the place that was thocht be ane end of thaim was ay found incommod for the rest. Alwayis a general excus was for al men that, if Grange wald declair himself in the Quenis caus, thai wald al concur; for without him the mater culd not be borne out. Grange had begun resonably well with thaim lang befor; yea immediatly after Murrayis deathe. For not only at thair requisitioun, and for forderance of the Quenis caus, he put to liberty Chatelherault, Seytoun, and Herries, the Sheref of Ayr, Sir James Hamilton and myself, being al prisoners at that tyme; but also being then Provest of Edinburgh, brocht by his meanes thair assemble from Lythtquo to Edinburgh, and maid the place seur for thaim, quhilk gave a great contenance to the Quenis caus, daschit hir adversairs, and gave thair caus sic a deadly wound that, if it had not bein revivit be the forces of Ingland, it wald then bein subvertit. For a forder declaration, quhan the Quenis enemies war al assemblit in Edinburgh to cheis Lenox Regent, though Grange was destitut of all confort of the Quenis favoraris, quha war far from him, yit he wald nather be present at thair convention for his consent to thair nomination, nor approve it, though he was ernestly preast thairto be the Quene of Inglandis agent in hir name, and inthreatenit if he did the contrary. Being requyrit to schut the gunnis of the Castle the tyme of thair proclamation of thair Regentrie, he not only refusit, but also professit in plain termis that he wald never recognos him for a lawful magistrat. Thairefter, at thair pretendit parliament, he refusit the sweird, sceptre and croun, quhairby all solemnity was kepit thairfra. Al thir heidis culd not satisfy the Quenis freindis, but or thai culd be brocht togither, he behuiffit to proceid forther, quhairby it apperit (as sensyn it has proven treu in effect) that mony socht subterfuges. Quhilk quhan he persavit, quhayras of reason thai aught to have preast him,

he was content to preas thaim, and wrait severally to every nobleman that had professed the Quene guid wil, requyring thaim to repair to Edinburgh, and he wald plainly join with thaim in the Quenis caus, & mak Edinburgh only patent to hir freindis, and debar from it hir enemies. The inferior sort of the nobility answirit, if Chatelherault quha then was in Argyle, Huntly & Argyle wald cum to Edinburgh, thai wald concur with thaim. Chatelherault and Argyle answirit, if Huntly & I, being then in the North, wald cum first to Edinburgh thai wald follow. Sua was the hail bourdin laid on Huntly & me; and at that tyme very hard for ony of us to com, the passage being so dangerous, and so haitit be our enemies, that al that evir we possessit wald not have savit us; besydis, at that same tyme, I was so diseasit in my persone, that I was nather abil to ryde nor gang. Yit knawing that, if I refusit, it wald serve for a stay to the rest, I set al danger asyd, and quhair I mycht not be careit be land, I come be sey, and almost baith at ane tyme, Huntly and I about the second of April last. Chatelherault cam as soon as he mycht. The Lord Home has bein heir thir seventeen monethis. The Lord Maxwel, Herries and Lochinvar cam at the first requisition. Argyle and Boyd cam at the twelfth of May, & eftir that thai had tareit three or four dayis, slippit away, quhan we had maist ado with thaim, we being besegit in the toun, and our enemies in the Abbey and Canongait. Sensyn we saw thaim not again. Of the hail rest of the nobility, never ane hes assistet us ather with his freindis, forces, or substance, nor yit has a barron of the hail realme comit to tak our pairt at ony time, but only Lochinvar, Farnyhairst and Balcleuch. This is al the ayde we have had within the realme; and of this nombre nane remanis ordinarly, but Chatelherault, Huntly and Home. Chatelherault has ordinarly na forces, but a very quyet houshold, not twelve personis, becaus of his poverty. Huntly has nane of his freindis heir, but indeed has ane honest houshold, and is at great charges. The Lord Home is not abil to beir a great part, as Ingland inhabits his houses, and kepis that hail cuntre in subjection, and intromittis with his leving sua that al our force standis be wagit men. Thir ar ernest on the adverse part, and conjurit enemies to the

Quene; Lennox, Morton, Mar, Glencarne, Buchan, Glammis, Lyndesay, Ruthven, Methven, Cathcart, Uchiltree, Sempill. Thair concurris with thaim at al tymes, conventions & assemblies, Craufurd, Montrois, Menteyth, Master Marchel, Master of Arrol, Yester, Borthwic, Dromond. Within thir twenty dayis, Argyle, Eglintoun, Cassilis & Boyd ar aggreit with thaim, subscryvit, & professit the young Prince obedience. Thair was ay traffik amang them, *but non ar thurtout endit.*[1] Rothis, Ogilbe, Forbes and Simmervil, though thai join not plainly with thaim as yit, in thair awin personis, yit thair freindis and servantis obeyis al thair proclamations and cums to thair gatherings as weil as the rest. Seyton Fleming & Levistoun ar out of the cuntre, quhairthrou thair tenantis obeyis thaim as the rest dois. Athol kepis himself at hame, and he nor his tenantis mellis with nather syd; and obeyis nather of thaim. Be this you may persave thai have ane universal obedience except within Edinburgh and a feu partis far distant thairfra. Thai intromet peaceably with the hail revenues of the croune and thriddis of benificis; thai have besidis thair awin levingis, in thair handis, the Bischoprik and Prieure of Sanct Androis, the Bischoprik of Glascow, Dumblaine, Arbroth, Pasley, Scone, Kilwynning, Coldinghame, Haddingtoune and North Berwik, the maist of Chatelherault's leving, Flemingis and myn, quhilkis, in the hail, wil extend to a great soume be yeir, and makis thaim abil, besyd the support of Ingland, to bear great charges, and sustein mony wagit men bayth on fut and hors. Be this you juge quhat difficulte we have to beir out our quarrel, and yit we ar not a quhit discouragit nor intendis to schrink; but houppis be Goddis grace, with the King of France's support, to bring it yit to a quyet end, in despyt of al our enemeis. It is lang sen we proclamit the Quenis authorite, and be parlement, in the maist solemne manner we culd divyse, fand the pretendit dimission of croune, the coronation of hir soun, and al that followit thairupon, nul. We have haldin a parliament in hir majesties name, in this moneth, and thairin forfaltit a nomber of her enemeis. The parliament yit runnis, and as our adversairs intendis, within two or three dayis, to forfalt, in thair maner,

[1] *Sic* in the decipher.

the maist part that assistis the Quene, we intend at the same tyme to forfalt al the principallis of our enemeis. We have brocht Edinburgh to hir perfyt obedience, except sa mony as hes left it. The hail war hes bein sen Apryl, and yit continuis, betwin Leith and Edinburgh, and is brocht from all the rest of the realme to thir twa tounis. Though our adversairs had the forces of the hail realme, have them lyand in quarters and a double greater nomber of wagit men, yit to this hour (praisit be God) thai have not advantage of ane man of us. For if they gat, at ony scarmouche the overhand of us, God sent us a recompense within aucht dayis efter. Thai have maid great braggis thir dayis bygaine, that thai suld hazard al thair lyvis, or enter in this, quhilk is sa weil fortifeit and provydit, that thai are constrainit to put water in thair wyn. God knawis quhat strait we have bein in for payment of our men of weir, in quhom our strenthe consistis, besydes the charges of the Castill, quhilkis man be great, for it is the only uphold of the Quenis caus. Al the money we have yit resavit from France is only twa thousand crounis and ane thousand pistollis, quhilkis Mr James Kircaldy brocht; of quhilk sum was deducit the expensis of his voyage and transporting of the money, and a smal portion of that money Johne Cheisholme brocht, quhilk was put asyde and savit, quhan he and the rest was taken. Sua that the hail sum resavit as yit is littil mair than wald entertain the Castle thir four monethis bygane, lat be to pay our men of weir. We have borrowit from merchandis, and employit the credit of al wald do for ony of us, and money is not easy to be had in Scotland presently be ony means; and if ever money had inlakit to pay the wagis, the soldartis wald incontinent mutin, and leif us, quhilk wald be our utter destruction and lose of the caus without recoverye. Thairfor I pray you remonstre to the King of France the necessite, in sik gud maner as you think is maist convenient, and wil best move him to mak substantial support, baith with money and furder as the caus requyris; and asseur him, his majestie anis dippand ernestly in the cause, it wil be easye to reduce this realme to the Quenis perfyt obedience. For if the pepil sau anis a force on our syde, thai wald al leif the advers faction, and tak pairt with us, and then smal support wald serve to

maintean the caus, from tyme the pepil war fallin from thaim. Above al thingis preas that na delay be usit in sending money and men if it be possible. For we wil be put to over great extremitie, if tyme be driven; and if we be supportit, we have guid meanes to forther the action, in so far as we have this toun at command, quhilk is the principal. It wil be hard for the advers partye to gar the Session sit in ony part of Scotland, as we have stayit the clarkis thairof in Edinburgh, with the hail buikis, wryttis and processis, quhilk wil be a great hinder to thair authoritie. Though the support of the Quene be costly to the King of France, yit I think he suld not plein the expensis, if he considder that in case he leif us destitut, Scotland wil fal in the Quene of Ingland's handis, and becom at hir devotion perpetuallye. For the relief of the debt we have contractit to pay our men of weir, you wil be sa guid as answeir the merchandis of the soume deboursit be thaime at the sicht of our writ. This far towart the public. For ane thing I man request you in particular, to wit, in favour of ane gentilman callit James Hamilton, sonn to Jamis Hamilton of Nelisland, quha is ane of Chatelherault's freindis and my kinnisman, to save the Abbacy of Kilwynning from Glencarne, ane of the despytful aganis the Quene and you in particular, and hes tain the said Abbay be Lennoxis gift. This gentilman was provydit to Kilwynning upon supplicationis, in anno millesimo quingentesimo, quinquagesimo primo, pridie Nonas Septembris, Pontificatus Julii tertii secundo, quhan my Lord of Kilwynning (to quhom he is brother son) was provydit to the Coadjutorye of St Androis. His bullis ar not in his handis, sua he wil lose the benefice. Heirfor I man pray you to speik to the Papis Nunce to wryt to the Court of Rome, to caus rais his bullis of neu, that the benefice may be preservit from that tratour, and quhatsomever may be bestowit thairon, you may retein sa mekil of the King of France or the Quenis moneye, that suld be send heir, and I sal caus advance als mekil heir. If it pleis you to do this at my request, besyd the common caus (quhilk it wil forder) you wil oblis me to you perpetuallye. Sua, efter my maist humil commendation, I commit you to the protection of God. From Edinburgh Castle, the xxviij of August.

Marked on margin in ordinary characters :—

You wil gett the alphabet of this chepheir be ane uthair moyen.

Addressed :—

To my vearay good Lorde, my Lord Archbischope of Glasgow, Ambassador for the Q. Matie, resident in the Court of France.

And marked :—

Rec^d^, the first of October, 1571.

No. 6.

Secretary Raulet to Archb^p^. Beaton.

Je vous supplye diversifier vostre chifre en ceste sorte. Changez ω τ avec *n*‡, item *or* avec ⊏8, item b d avec ες, item 4 11 avec 97, item : avec ?, item *g* avec ||. J'ay grand peur que le trop de suffisance de quelcun soit cause de son mal, et du nostre. C'est pitie quand la cupidité de gloyre nous precipite a une ostentation abortive, et une miserable condition de ceux qui ont a faire a telles gens. J'ay maincte foys esté tencé, depuis mon retour, pour avoir trop bien deviné. Plust a Dieu que l'opinion fust confirmée que ce que j'en disoy n'estoit que pour revenche des tortz qu'il m'avoyt faitz : et Dieu m'est temoing du contraire. Je crain aussi que celluy, dont l'ambition et folye est si grande, de pretendre plus haut qu'il né doibt, ayt seconde la trahison du monstre son frere, a l'endroict du Seigneur qui est en peine pour nous, et qu'il a fait descouvrir l'argent. Il scayt trop de nos affaires, et est capable de faire beaucoup de mal. La principale occasion de son premier voyage estoit pour traverser les desseings du dict Sieur. Je croy que cestuycy est de mesme, et que la religion luy ay doublé son mal talent. Il a en congé, a ce voyage par deux foys, de venir icy, qui est une grande faveur, mesmes a la derniere. Car il n'estoit permys a la Royne, ny d'escrire,

ny de recevoir aucunes lettres que par les mains de ses gardes, ny de parler aux messagers qu'en leur presence. Mais cestuycy a en toute liberté, et telle marchandise ne se donne pour rien en ce temps cy. Burleigh est grand changeur de telles dinrees. Je vous supplye conseiller le gentilhomme qui appartient au susdict Seigneur, et luy donne bonne espérance. Monsr de la Mothe nous mande que ce ne sera rien. Son chifre changé n'a encore esté en autre main que la myenne, et me peut seurement ecrire. Si je suis chassé apres les autres, je le larray[1] a la Royne. L'autre commung est décélé, et entre les mains de la Royne d'Angleterre, comme je croy que avez entendu. De Cheefield le xx Septembre, Raulet votre obeissant et tres affectionné serviteur.

Marked outside:

Recu, le xiiijme d'Octobre, 1571. Mr Leviston.

No. 7.

Lord Seton to Archbr. Beaton.

Monseigneur, j'ay resceu vostre lettre datée du second de ce mois a Paris, par laquelle j'entends encores qu'estes en peine du chiffre, que m'avez envoyé, s'il est a moy ou non. Monseigneur, je m'eusse tenu bien pour lourdau de le retenir si long temps entre mes mains, s'il ne fust este a moy. Par quoy vous ne vous en donnerez de paine, s'il vous plait. Mon filz euist este vers vostre service ja passé cinq semaines, n'euist este une fiebvre qu'il at eue, qui luy tient encores, et ay grand paour qu'il ne tombe en la fiebvre quarte, qui est cause de son retardement, et grand ennuy a moy de n'avoir peu partir pour aller ou que scavez, et pour le present resolu de me partir, et le laisser icy tant qu'il soit guerry pour vous aller trouver. Nous avons eu de nouvelles tant confortables d'Escosse de la deffaite de Sterling, et prinse du prince, qui nous resjouist tant icy, que nous panssons jamais avoir mauvais temps cy après. Je scay fort bien qu'avez entendu la

[1] Probably a contraction for "laisserai."

malheureuse prinse du Duc de Nortfolc, qui me garde vous escripre plus avant. Monseigneur, n'ayant aultre matire vous escripre, vous baiseray humblement les mains, vous supplyant me commander, comme a celluy qui desire vous estre toute sa vie tres obeissant, et d'aussi bonne volunté que je prie Dieu qu'il vous doinct, Monseigneur, en bonne santé et longue vie. De Bruxelles, le xxj jour de Septembre, 1571.

Vostre humble amy frere et serviteur

SETON.

Addressed :

A Monsieur Monsieur le Reverendissime Archevesque de Glasgo, Ambassadeur pour sa Royne ma Souveraine aupres du Roy tres Chretien. En Court.

No. 8.

to ARCHB^P. BEATON.

L.F.[1] The 22 of this moneth I received your good Lordship's letter of the 9 of this present, & for hast of this messenger, I have no further leysure but to say that, by the Bisshop of Rosses oune letter wryten to a greate man here, dated at Paris in December, yt appeareth that he hath bine there, & was determined to passe further, I nede not tel your Lordship whyther, synce you thinke not good to be acknowen to me of his beyng there

Touching your Lordship's affirmation that & have so little affection to the Hameltons as to the Stewards, howsoever your pleasure is to be acknowen of no more to me, yet I assure myselffe your wysdom is to great to be of that opinion. The reasons are so many, so evident, and so many wayes confirmed by theyr dayly dedes and accions, that I finde none of any nation that seeth yt not: and therfor your Lordship wyl pardon me though I thinke you say this for some other pollicy, and that yourselffe looketh to se yt fal out otherwyse. God preserve your good Lordship in al honor, as

[1] Query, Lord Fleming.

I am bounde to pray for. The 25 of January, at Mackeline. Yours ever to commande assuredly.

Marked outside:

Rec^{d}, the thryd of February, 1574.

No. 9.

[To the letter of Q. MARY to ARCHB. BEATON, "Sans date (Juin 1574)," entered in Prince Labanoff's work, vol. iv. p. 176, is the following postscript, not published by him:]

; elle est froyde.

Le reste est de moy, pour vous dire que je vous ay ecrit aujourdhui bien au long; mais je crains que mes lettres ne viennent a bonne part. Je suis accusé de là, et sobsonné icy; mais Dieu aydant, je ne meriteray ny l'un ny l'autre. Sa majeste a voullu veoir mes lettres, mais je ne les eusse sceu monstrer entieres, et m'acquitter de mon debvoyr envers vous. et parce je vous prie de brusler mes lettres, et me mander en quelles termes vous voullez que je vous ecrive cy après. Ce 3. de ī et Dieu soyt avec vous.

[Written by Mr Beaton, the Archbishop's brother, and enclosing the following paper:]

—— BEATON to ARCHB^{P}. BEATON.

Monsieur, d'autant que sa majesté vous ecrit bien amplement, il ne me reste sinon ce a qui sa majeste n'a respondu. Sa majesté receut vos lettres du 4: de ī en double forme, et du 4: de L , environ d: de a ; et si elles eussent peu estre leues sans moy, je n'eusse sceu autre chose, mais ne scachant comment s'en ayder autrement, elles me furent donnes l ; du dict a . J'ay rendu bonne compte du tout a sa majesté, comme vous cognoystres par ses lettres. Miraumont n'est apparu pardeça, ny ses lettres aussy, s'il vient j'auray bonne souvenance de ce que me vous commandes. Monsr de Rosse a

bien le moyen de vous enseingner a qui vous pouves envoyer vos lettres a Londres, s'il veut, sans vous mettre en peine de hazarder des voyes dangereuses. Sa majesté ne veut continuer le moyen de vous escrire par moy, comme ell vous ecrit. Car sa majesté dict que souvent se presenteront de discours si longe que sa majesté ne les pourra ecrire de sa main. Je vouldroy que vous eussies ecrit a sa majesté et non à moy ; car sa majesté pense que je vous ay conseille de m'ecrire ainsi, a fin que par mesme moyen, j'entendis plus de ses affaires ; et parceque je n'ay voullu faire autre instance. Je vous prie ecrives a sa majesté votre intention. Je ne refuse nul labeur, mais que ce soit a votre contentement, plus pour le plaisir que je recepveroys d'avoyr par foys de vos nouvelles, que pour estre trop curieux de scavoir l'estat des affaires de sa majesté. Car je m'estimeray heureux d'ignorer le χ de mon prince et o:: alors que les affaires de plus grande consequence sont communiqués a des petits compaignons : d'autant que, si quelque chose vient a etre divulgué temerairement, on ne prent souvent aux plus innocens. Encores je suis bien marry de n'avoir jamais sceu de vos affaires, depuys troys ans, pour le regret que j'ay de ne vous avoir donne aucun advertissement de ce qui vous est tourné a tel deplaisir et domage, et a mon deshonneur, si j'estois coupable de ce dont on m'accuse. Monsieur, il me suffit que vous ne croyes ceste imposture. Je me suis justifié envers sa majesté ; monstrant la copie des articles de ma commission ecrite a La Ferte l'an mil cinq cent septante en Decembre. Alors, je demandois en votre nom, pour le grand regret que vous avies de la mort de feu Mons de Betoun, mon frere, qui fut opprimé par telles calomnies, et vous mesme faulsement accusé de déloyauté, joint a l'extreme necessité en laquelle vous esties, qu'il pleust a sa majesté vous faire donner pasport pour venir rendre compte de votre negociation, et puis vous permettre de vous retirer en votre maison, pour vivre hors des yeulx de ceux qui vous calomnioient en votre charge : a quoy j'ay adjousté que dés alors sa majesté me dict qu'elle vous satisfayroyt de telle sorte que vous lesseries ceste resolution, et qu'elle adviseroit a vous ayder du sien. J'ay appelé Dieu a temoingne, et la conscience de sa majesté, que ny des lors, ny depuys, ny par

votre commandement, ny de moymesme je ne parlay jamais a sa majesté de sa chancellerie. J'ay prié sa majesté de considerer si sa promesse ne convient pas bien avec ce que m'ecrivez maintenant de ce que sa majesté vous a ecrit en ā, il a troys ans, et sa majesté m'a juré que jamais elle ne vous a ecrit telles lettres ; et pour ce, si elles sont extantes, je vous prie les garder. Je n'ay rien voulu disputer de la suffisance de votre successeur, car nous sommes du tout persuadés que beaucoup de belles parolles doybvent produire des montagnes d'or. Quant est a feu mon frere, je n'ay faict difficulté de dire que ce ne sont offices de Christiens d'accuser les mors, nommément un si homme de bien, et un si bon frere en son vivant, et a la parolle de sa majesté j'ay apperçu que ceste imposture ne fut jamais forgé aux cerveau de sa majesté, non plus que l'autre. Sa Majesté persiste en ce que vous aves recommandé par vos lettres, du Verger. J'ay demandé les veoyre pour vous en advertir en cas que l'eussies oublié ; mais ce sont fables. Ce que je vous prie bien humblement de poyser, Monsieur, et penser que ce n'est merveilles si on accuse les prisonniers et les mors, puys qu'on vous accuse devant vous mesme, vous constituant, contre toute forme de justice, le criminel et le juge. Voyla ce que je vous puys mander des responses de sa majesté. J'ay dechifré l'une des lettres de Monsr le Cardinal, et entends que sa majesté en fait bien peu de compte, comme vous cognoystres par sa response. Sa majesté m'a dict secretement que c'est pour luy que tout le jeu se joue, mais qu'elle ne le veult dire publiquement. Car il disposoit trop liberalement de son bien, sans que ceux qui estoient pourveus se sentissent obligés a sa majesté ; et pour ce que sa majeste scavoit bien que vous series tousjours constraint de faire tout a son plaisir, elle a choysy un homme qui ne recognoystra que sa majesté seulle. Quant est a ce que m'ecrives privement et de votre main, et de la q d'icelles, ce a este une grande accession aux ennuys que ceste captivité m'a apporté. Je suis bien de votre opinion, que les plus dignes ne seront jamais les mieux recogneux par deça. Je l'ay experimenté a mes despens, et ay pensé mil foys qu'ilz sont plus heureux pour ceste court qui ont suyvy les batelleurs que non pas les bonnes escolles. Je vous ecrirai quelque

jour plus au long de ma fortune. Je ne scai quelle part j'ay par dela, mais icy il me convient endurer mil indignités. Encores, pour bien, ou pour mal, je n'ay jamais en autre opinion que d'attendre la fortune de sa majesté, telle que Dieu l'envoyeroit, tant pour en cela rendre le debvoir d'un homme de bien a ma souverainne, que pensant aussy vous faire service agréable. Mais enfin, je me suys rendu si subject par benevolence, que maintenant par force on me veut faire suyvre le mesme chemin. Brief pour estre le bien venu icy, il fault scavoir menasser, et murmurer, et hors d'icy il fault scavoir aussy bien faire un meschant tour pour estre craint, que quelque bonne service pour estre aymé. Quant a Monsr Hotoman, il n'estoit requys d'attendre autre advis de moy. Je vous prie faites comme pour vous mesmes et votre commodité, pour vous en servir et du proffit et du principal et de moy tout ensemble, en vostre besoing. Mais puysque demandes mon opinion, je scay que le sort ne se peut repeter de la maison de ville, quand on vouldroit, ce qui pourroit estre necessaire quelque jour; et entre marchans et personnes privées, je ne sache homme en France de sa robbe, a qui je me voulluz fier tant, qu'en Monsr Hottoman. Au reste, Monsieur, entre tous mes ennuys, ce n'a pas esté le dernier que je n'ay jamais peu entendre vos nouvelles, ny vous écrire librement des miennes, depuys que je suis icy. Sa majesté, ayant veu celles que je receu par Halle, sobsonna que je ne fauldroys a m'excuser en ce qui m'estoit imposé, et par ce voullut veoire mes lettres, et me constraint a les reformer, non qu'il y eut aucune chose indigne de moy, mais par ce que la verité me commandoit ecrire tout le contraire de ce qui avoit ecrit par avant, au nom de sa majesté. Mais puisque sa majesté ne veut que j'entends de vos affaires par son moyen, je vous prie humblement, a l'advenir, de m'advertir privement de ce que vous penseres m'importer, et je me revancheray par tout humble service, si en quelque chose je vous puys agréer. Monsieur, je n'ignorerai jamais mon debvoyr vers sa majesté, mais je ne la penseray jamais offenser aussi pour rendre ce que vous doybs. Si c'estoit le plesir de Dieu, je vous vouldroy voire une foys encore en ma vie, et si ce n'est dans un an et jour, mon esperance, a ce que je puys estimer, sera vaine.

Car il ne me fauldroyt pas beaucoup de telles hyvers que ceste derniere passée a esté. Il y a bien huit mois que je n'ay jamais en troys jours de santé, et si mon mal est confirmé, de sorte que je n'espere rien mieux en ceste prison, je ne me laisse de tenir le lieu que je tiens icy. Dieu me soit temoing; mais je me vouldrois reserver a meilleur temps, si faire se pouvoit; neantmoins, mon epitaphe temoignera peut etre cy apres que le service de sa majesté m'aura esté plus cherre que mon bien, ma liberté, et ma vie. L'assurance que j'ay que vous brusleres mes lettres, comme j'ay fait des votres, m'a donne la hardiesse de vous parler franchement. n:· Seigneur Jesus Christ vous doint tout bonheur et felicité, et a nous quelque esperance de liberté.

Marked outside:

Recu, le iiij^{e} Juillet, 1574. Par Sabran.

No. 10.

Mr Beatoun to Archb^{p}. Beatoun.

Monsieur, Neantmoins que sa majesté ayt respondu a vos lettres du jour de la Pentecoste, et du œ de ē si amplement qu'il ne me reste que vous escrire, si est que j'ay bien voullu adjouster que sa majesté me dist, ayant leu vostre advis sur la negotiation du Capitaine Leith, qu'elle estoit bien ayse d'entendre que la France commençoyt a se destromper des impostures d'Angleterre, et que vous auriez bien de quoy rementovoyr a leurs majestés tres Christiennes les advises du temps passé, dont on faisoit si peu de compte. La conclusion de celle du jour de la Pentecoste est plain, e de bonne esperance. Dieu veulle que le fruit respond a icelle. Sa majesté m'a monstré la lettre que Raullet voulloit escrire au Cardinal de Lorraine, et neantmoins que j'ay tousjours fait estat de meriter vostre bonne grace par autre moyen que par mesdire et rapporter d'autruy, je ne penseray cependant offenser le debvoyr de Chrestien, et homme de bien, de vous faire part de ce que j'ay leu et veu, escrit de sa main au n: de ē

Cependant, pour ne vous importuner, je me contenteray de vous toucher deux articles. L'un est qu'il voulloit que sa majesté escrivist au Cardinal de Lorraine que vous avies negligé des advertissementz qui n'importoyent de rien moins que de la vie de sa Majesté, d'autant qu'il alloit de vostre particulier. Je ne scay de quelle chimere il veule parler. L'autre estoit que sa majesté désiroit avoyr intelligence directement avec le Cardinal de Lorraine pour reprimer vostre arrogance, qui presume la tenir en tutele, et ne luy faire autre part des nouvelles de ses amys que telles que bon vous semble. Je ne scay qui l'a irrité, si ce n'est sa conscience ; mais il est outrageusement medisant. Il dist, à ce que sa majesté m'a fait entendre, qu'il a bien de quoy faire enrager le triumvirat, parlant de vous ℒ̃ et Lalendoze. Il dist que vous autres ambassadeurs n'estes que espions, et que s'il estoit par dela, il feroit plus de service a sa majesté en un jour que vous ne faites en six ans. Cependant le pauvre homme est malade, de sorte que pour la charité Chrestienne, tant que sommes icy, nous avons pitie de luy. Il dissimule avec moy, et je ne fais semblant de rien sçavoyr. Encores ce jourdhuy il m'a parlé bien honnestement de vous, et moy a luy non d'autre chose que de sa santé. Quand il demandait si importunement mon chiffre, sa majesté m'advisa de respondre que j'avoys tousjours servi en reputation d'homme de bien, et que je ne servioys jamais roy ny royne au prix d'estre sobsonné pour autre. Je demanday davantage si c'estoit vous ou moy que sa majesté sobsonnoit ? Et de ceste question il demeura bien fort estonné. Au reste, Monseigneur, vous verrés, par une lettre ouverte de sa majesté, quelle consideration sa majeste a sur vostre estat present. Je suis bien marry de ne vous pouvoyr ayder ny servir en rien. Je vous ay escrit mil foys que ce qui est a moy est a vous, et pleust à Dieu que vous vous puissiez ayder en vendant tout ce que j'ay en Escosse. Sa majesté vous advertit des nouvelles d'Angleterre, et par ce je ne vous diray sinon que ♁̃ et |:|.̃ commencent fort de s'aigrir l'un contre l'autre. Cependant, on dist qu'ilz s'accorderont assez bien en ce qui nous pourra nuyre. L'orloge que sa majesté demandoit estoit pour M. de Seton; je vous prie que le faciez faire. Elle desyre un tel

que le vostre, avec un reveil matin à part, qui se puysse mettre quand l'on vouldra. L'escuyer m'a prié vous remercyer d'avoyr en ses affaires recommandés. Il dist que Monsieur Duverger a procuration bien ample de luy; cependant il vous escrira par la premiere despesche ouverte que sa majeste fera. Plusieurs seigneurs et gentilshommes se retirent d'icy. Les affaires sont gouvernés par des hommes nouveaux, et l'ancienne noblesse est fort mal edifié de l'estat present. Pour conclusion, Monseigneur, le jour que Monsieur Duverger partit d'icy, en or et argent monoye, je n'avoys que septante cinq escus. Je n'ay pas este trop mauvais menager despuys, ayant presté de cela a Hamilton. Si vous pouvez envoyer quelcun des vostres par deça, suyvant l'advis de sa majesté, vous me ferez, s'il vous plaist, tel support que vos affaires le permetront. Je vous prie que ce soit Guillaume Walcar. L'intelligence que sa majesté vous veult donner c'est un gentilhomme qui fut prattiqué par fu mon frere Monsieur de Betoun. Archibald Betoun me le feit cognoystre, et je l'ay tousjours entretenu comme j'ay peu. C'est un homme de qui ce peult dire, *il nostro amico, e non della fortuna.* Ecrivez moy, si vous plaist, la reception de mes lettres, surtout de celles du 5: de ī. J'estois alors en grande paine, craignant que sa majeste ne me veulleust en bon essent oster le moyen de vous escrire; depuys sa majesté, voyant la malice de l'homme, m'a fait ce bien de m'assurer, me mettant la parolle en ma bouche pour me defendre. J'ay escrit par Halle à mon cousin de Betoun pour avoyr *n:* de burat de soie pour M. de Seton. Je vous prie pour l'honeur de Dieu me faire ce bien de me l'envoyer avec les premieres hardes que vous envoyeres a sa majesté, en cas que je ne le puysse avoir par la voye susdict. Non plus, Monseigneur, sinon que n$\tilde{}$ vous donner heur et felicité en present et a l'advenir. De Chefeld ce ɛ: de 4̄ Vostre tres humble et tres affectionné frere et serviteur de Betoun. Sa majesté vous envoye presentement lettres de sa main au ℒ , pour vous authoriser en attendant le moyen de vous expedier une nouvelle commission.

Marked on the back:

Recu, le iiij Sept^{r}, 1574 par Vassal a Lyon.

No. 11.

Mr Beatoun of Balfour to Archbr. Beatoun.

Monsieur, je vous escript in ye monaiths of Julie & Agust advertist be ye Lord Saton ye resavit my writings, fra ye Capitain of Calais, ane uthir to the Den of Glasgo, the thred to the Ladie Fairnihaist. Non obstant of my lait remonstrans of this voyadge, maid be Morton, he hais doun the samin for ane occasion, as within schort tym I am abil to mak you treu advertisment. Morton was informit of ane conspiracie conjurit aganis him in this cuntré be Ingland; he knawis the parsonis, douis mak thaim al ane fair faice, & is to handil the mater to thair panis. I am in hand to gait treu intelligence of his procedings, and abil with tym to obtein licens & reteir myself, súpos I was aisalie persuadit be frendis to reteir myself heir, quhair ye sal be instrukit of sic efaris as I kan nocht put in writ. Le 28 de Septembre I gat presence and speiche of Morton in Lochlevn, obtenit ane main anseur. Quo die, Balfour, Seton, Heriot, archeirs of the gard war examinit, altogither traitours to thair maister the King, spak to the advantage of his enemis, & eschaipin of the Duke of Alançon. Give thai haid ben trustie, I lukit for sum word fra you; but thai all pat me in despair, declarin of your deadlie seiknes. I dout nocht bot your wisdom hais considerit my writing I send be the Den of Glasgo moien, quhairin I maid mention quhou the tiran may be brocht to the King of Frans & our maistres devotion, ane mater hard to cridit, bót it beand secritlie handilit, I sal expon my lif to bring it to pas. This ye man bewar of thaim ye mak participant of ye mater. Ingland is fairit & suspektis al man. And consider it be your wisdom. His substans al insfortar is presentlie in his handis, togitheir wit the quenis joules,[1] quhilkis may be moien rather obtenit than be force. And at the present contrivit to submit himself to the weil of Ingland, haifand na uthir subterfudg. Seand the tym sa dangerous, *salutem ex inimicis* mon be socht. Give ye think the cours to be run, I writ of befor, haist me ansur; & give thankis to Schir James Balfour, for I hop he sal be the

[1] Jewels. The spelling in this and the following letters is curious.

occasion of my deliverans: & with Godis grace ye sal find materis succeid to your contentiment. De ceste affaire je ne veulx plus dire, me remettant a vostre judgement. Thair is ane Inglisman calit David Sontobe heir & remain agent; Robert & James Mailings are grit with him; to the quhilks I am additit for thair gud weilis. Pourquoy je vous prie to recognos the sam to thair bruthir Andrew & John Chesolme: it weil caus the brethir conteneu thair amitie, and mak me participant of the weil of Ingland, at quhais instans and thais traitours I writ of befor, I am detenit & was maid prisoneir. Thair was ane convention laitlie held in Stirling, in the quhilk Morton's, Arbroth's & his bruthir's deth was conspirit, and there be certain nobilmen, quhilkis durst nocht compeir personalie thamsalfis, bot be commisioneirs. To this ye Ministers, & bourows convenit; amangis tham concludit the sur kepin of the prince, the vondication of Murai's & Lenox murthir. The mater is discoverit. Quhat sal folow, as maters takis efek, ye sal be advertist. Morton, Huntlie and Hamilton ar bandit & confedirit in sort as the Wardin of laird Adame was movis.[1] Je ne puis retirer et ne melle ne de Argyl, Arbroth, Saton, de belle parolle, rien oultre. Je vous recommand le pouvoir Ladie Argil quhai hais laift nathing onspendit in the law, and justice stopit; it war ane meritorious turn to reteir ansur fra the Quen, al scho haid is spendit. The tiran contenuis in his rigour aganis Fairnihaist. Je vous prie to hald maister James Irving besines in ramembrans. Je suis fort obligé a luy. Si vous plaist d'escripre ung mot de lettre a Monsr de Wemis, quhai standis frendlie to al you partenis. Now, my Lord, gif my servis and advertisiment be agreabil, doutes nocht bot ye haif maid ye Quen partecipant hopes sa far in God that he weil inclin hir hart to suport me now in my aidlit days, and gif me moyen to end my lyf in that cuntrie. For to mak me the king of the warld wald I remain heir, for consciens caus, contrinit to gif airis to abbomination contrair God & his Kirk. Your sister's dochter is nocht transportit, nor yet ane inventeur tain of umquhil your bruthirs geir. It stud nocht in me. George Douglas is opon his pairtein; hais obtenit Mortonis suplication to pas trocht Ingland. He is

[1] *Sic* in decipher.

ane grit courtiour. I desir you anes agen to bewar wyth your auld man Jhon Levingston, quha is altogitheir the tiranis. I was desirit be ane faithful frend to advertis you lik as I deid; input na fault bot ye gait oftes of my writings; I spair nother panis nor exspensis, as God is judge. Thair is sum secreit misterei in hand, as yet I kan nocht, but scortlie sal mak you to be informit. Thai frendis I confidit in drew me heir for thair awyn comoditie; man tak patiens quhil God provid, to quhais protection I comit you now & evir. Writing, the twelt of October, be your maist humbil servand BETHUNE. Vostre bieng bonne amye pour vous faire servis

JEHANE DE LA RUE.

No. 12.

Mr BEATOUN of Balfour to ARCHBp. BEATOUN.

I resavit your letter daitit at Paris the saxt of September, with ane to the Lord Seton, ane uthir to Irving, the secund of this instant, & mervelit that you send nocht anseur of certaine porpos the Den of Glasgo & I writ to you in the moneth of Julie anentis Mortonis mind & intention,[1] the quhilk he hais maid onlie Schir James Balfour previe. War nocht the assuranse we haif that thai ar cum to your handis, I wald writ of new. Alwais thai desir ansur with grit devotion. Of this I may assur you, that thair is na man apon lif, excep the tiraine, Schir James the sen & I yit kennis our intention, bot ye, & that be our writing. For it is bot feir onlie that causis him depend apon Ingland, & wald be glaid to enteir in frendship with the King and parforme al he culd or micht, with that the mater be secritlie handillit. Ingland fairris al man, and suspekis al man cummin furth of Frans. Wantand judgiment in sik hicht affairis, submitis and referis the mater to your wisdome. Fordir ye may be assurit the prince to be in na dangeir, I men for present ocasion, to be put to the fieldis, nor yit deliveret to Ingland. In the main tym I feir the tirane to geit him in his handis. Of this yo may be assurit the Arskinis,

[1] He alludes to the overtures made about this time by Morton to the Queen of Scots. See a full explanation in the letter of Lord Ogilvie, p. 539.

nor nain dependis apon thaim to be worth ane denier. Thair is quhilkis, for thair particulair avansiment, causis men beleif that thai menit nevir perform, nochtwythstandin of thair promes maid to you and the Cardinal of Loran. Tim weil try elk mannis upricht dailing. Thair is monie baronis weil mindit, few to put onie thing to execution. As for erlis & lordis, altogethir fals. I culd weil dou servis with that it wald plais you send me your mind and instructionis. I suld us the sam as I saw the tim. Quhairas ye mak mention that thair is na silvir to be haid for na mannis entertenement, without asurans that the prence be nocht rendirrit in Ingland; for my pairt, God is judge, I desir nain. For it I douis for the Quenis and yours servis, gif it be fund agreabil to hir and you, I dout nocht bot ye weil craif me recompans, as I merit. The contentis of your writing sal be fulfilit. The inventeur of your umquhil brutheris geir send with the first comoditie. Sen this last defaict in Frans, the tiraine has taine up his gard. Capitan Wemis, that mareit your Sister, is mindit to cum in Frans, as I am informit, nochtwithstandin of my remonstranis maid in the contrair to your sisteir. Scho is the persuader of him thairto. Balfour & Melgum ar appontit apon the silveir was gevin for my maister's blud. Ye plais writ gentlie to the laird of Lundie, quhai hais declarit to me that he hais ane blank of yours, quhilk ye left in his faidir's handis. He hais maid me half ane grant; alwais I think your writing necessair.

The bridail of Angus and Rothes dochter beis the 18 day of December; suponit that Wems & he sal agrie. In lyk maner Carmichael past na forder nor York, suponit for the Quen of Inglandis seiknes. Haifand na lasair, can nocht writ at the present as I wald. Maist humblie prais you to send the Den & me anseur of our formeir writings; for I am in esperance that we haif proponit sal tak gud success. Anentis the Hamiltonis & Arbroth, seand na uthir outgate war contrinit to appont for my Lord Claud. I weil, apon my lyf, anseur for his fedilitie and lawtie. The mariadge is nocht hastilie tak effek betwix Arbroth and Lady Bukcluch. I writ at mair lainth with my cusing James Foster in the moneth of October. Lukis with great devotion for anseur. I pray God to manten your honor & to grant me grace to dou you agreabil service.

At Sanct Andreus, the twentie of November, be your maist humble & obedeant servand. BETHUNE.

Let my Lord Ogilvie ken that his business of Fairnol sal nocht be forget, gif my Ladie Argyl cum to her intent, as thair is gud appereans.

No. 13.

Mr BEATON of Balfour to ARCHB. BEATON.

This uthir letter beand writing in gryt haist, the beirrair beand departit, chanssit for sum occasion that presentit to cum to Edinbrocht, quhair I did ranconteir this beirraire; sa haiffand short lasair, writ thir few lynis, and to falyou furth quhow I haif procedit be frinds avicies the consall and opinion I did schaw to my ants Janet & Katherin, and to my niece Jene. Sen this first letter, the Den of Glasgow & I hais apointit to mak ane inventeur of your brutheris coffairis, quhilk scortlie sal be send to you. Thair hais chansit laitlie for nowiles my Lord Regentis G. beand in Dumfrice, accumpanied wyth diverss nobillmen, amangis uthyris my Lord of Arbroth, Lord Boyd, Sr James Hammiltoun, quhais eldest soun that mariet my Lord Boydis dochtyr, accumpanied wyth tway youngier brethyr, and ane gud nombir of men, thocht to haif surprisit ye castell of Draiffain, & myst the samyng unroullie hymself hurt and all his cumpanie in will of the Capatain, quhai ussit thaim gentillie. Efter the word cóme to my Lord Regentis G., Sr James maid his purgeing to my Lord of Arbroth declairrit his innocencie. Quhait sal falyou I am uncertain. In the main tym my Lord Claud is apon his gairdis & hais mannit the castell of Hammiltoun. It is supponit this enterprice was nocht by my Lord Boydis advice. For the haill evidentis & jowellis that pertenis the hous of Hammilton was thair. Boyd wald be at Arrane, & hais court at weil. As maters takis effek, ye sal be advertisit. In the main tym, I sal travail with my Lord Claud, quhai is wys & constant; my Lord of Galloway is decessit; and at this present na esperans

of lyf to my Lord of Angus. I man maist hartlie pray you to send me anseur of sum writing I send to you in the moneith of Agust anentis certaine tryffillis, and, in special, resolution of dailing wyth that court, wyth the quhilk the tiran wald enteir in familiaratie, gif it be thocht gud to you, and ye plais mak me participant of your intention thairanent. I sal los my lyf an maters succeed nocht to your contentiment, beand secreitlie handilit. Failyeand, lat al ly deid; for na man kanis ye mater bot Schir James, the Den & I. Your wisdom plais put silence to me anentis the premisis, or elles your opinion & consal, ye may be assurit of me; and becaus I can gyf na anseur, it is judgeit that ye gyf na trust to nabodie in this parteis. Send alwais to the Den, that onie ane of us may thank Schir James. Al your graith in thir parteis is weil, excep samekil as that tratour Minto disponit apon. I am desirit to requir your honor of the gift of the mariadge of Castilmilk, in despit of Minto. Thair is favoris promissit me thairanent. As to the gift maid to you, I haif it, as quhair your of Condeland, sche hais demittit the assignation ye maid to hir, quhane she mareit Condeland, ondirstandand your will heiranent; & gyf I obtein onie thing, it sal be to your awyne us as rason wald. In that I craif, c'est seulment de avoyr me revenge de that trateur Minto, quhai tuk ane gift of the trateur Murray. I weil nocht forder trubill you, but I dout nocht or this present comis that ye haif ressavit cheiss & salmond, and haring sal be send in deu tym. Let all my cognossans ressaif my commendationis, nocht forgeittand your awyn pairt, and excuss my schort & haistie writings; ye knaw my imperfection & ineptitud.[1] Tak alwais gud weil in payment. I pray God to grant you hes grace wyth full contentiment, as I desyr for myself. Writing of Leith, the xxvij of November 1575.

It is mervellit heir with manie quhou that pestilent trateur Drisdail is sufferit thair, ane daily writair of lies, in sort as he passes Cokborn. Advise quhat ordour ye weil haif tain with the goldin chalice and the silver wark, that is in Fintrie's handis sormontand to trtie stane. In al ye wald I deid writ at lainth, weil God, ye sal find nathing oursen. I am to pas to

[1] He uses various words which, from the strange spelling, it is impossible to make out.

Fintrie for ordour takin with your niepce. Au surplus I fair Melgum sal bair awai Lucrice.

No. 14.

Mr BEATOUN of Balfour to ARCHBP. BEATOUN.

You sal heir rasave the inventeur of the hail geir uychtin your umqhil brodirs, coferis, wrytingis & buikis being except. As to the writingis, Fentre, Condiland & I put tham in ane bonnet cais twa yeir syn, onsein be ony body, and lokit it suirly, quhilk is in the manis, and your sister hes the keyis, as scho hes the rest of the keyis of the cofers. And maid this inventur, Goven, Cardros, scho, hir husband Wemis beand presand, wychtout quhom we culd get nathing done. I wrait sindry tymes before how Schir James Balfour, Goven & I fel in resonyng, & how the regent mycht be brocht to the Kyng of France devotion, be your labours & his. Gyf ye thocht the samyng to-be done, & thinkis, we lang for your ansour.[1] The bruit is heir that the Kuein of Ingland is deid; the Erle of Angus deidly seik; Lord Sempil, Bischop of Galowe (Gordon), Capitan Crawford deid, & yong Schir James Hamilton, kuha was schot at Drfan thinkand to have stoun the hous frā the Lord of Arbrocht, he being in Drumfries wycht the Regent presently, kuha is putand ordur thair to the Bordur. The berir wil declair the weilfair of frendis, and rest of the estit of this countrech; & sua comitis you to the protection of God. Of Scong,[2] in heist, the fyft day of December, your arld servitour at comand ever redy. BALFOUR.

This word that is put away in the inventur was your broder's naim.

Marked outside:

Resavit in Diepe, the xij of Marche, 1576.

[1] He again alludes to the overtures of Morton. See the letter of Lord Ogilvie, p. 539.

[2] *Sic* in decipher.

No. 15.

Mr Beatoun of Balfour to Archbp. Beatoun.

Sen my last writing with Tomas was, Morton and his adherantis hais ben setand apon the effairis and polacie of thair senagog, nocht as yeit concludit. And ane scamful bruit raisin divulgait amongis the pepil for the slauchter & cruel murthir of the kingis ambassadeur, commitit be Morton and Quene of Inglandis command. Ye weil knaw beter this mater nor I. I haif intelligens aneucht; gif the purs wald hald half silver weil gait moyen. Non obstant that I writ of my Lord Humis deliverans, the contrair is treu. Na apparans of mi fredom; and ondir caution of five thussind pundis that I sal nother writ to you nor haif intelligens, as als apon mi f. Ye man heirfor bewar that he quhai decepheris my writingis to you be secreit, or I weil peris. Abon al bewar wyth al thais I haif maid you alredie advertisiment of. For, as I maid you advertissiment of befor, thair is that braikis your braid dalie, that writis manifest lies of you. Amangis the rest of thais tratours bewar with Gilbert Doudlas; and as ye may, gar furnis me sum silver; for heir thair nother cridens nor trust. Send me word of yor mind. I sal dou gud weil to perform the sammin. Writin in haist, the twentie sax of Mairch. Yor maist humbil servand. Bethune.

No. 16.

Mr Beatoun[1] to Archbishop Beatoun.

Monsieur, j'ay receu vostre dernier chiffre, de quelle date je ne scais, car je ne l'ay peu dechiffrer entierement, pour avoyr bruslé tous mes papiers des le moys de Juing, et mon A B C au moys d'Octobre suyvant. Toutes fois, non sans peine, je me suis efforcé a resembler les simples, tant pour repondre a ce que me mandes, que pour vous assurer de la bonne

[1] Andrew Beatoun, the brother of the Archbishop.

volonté que j'ay de satisfaire a mon debvoyr, en ce que concerne le service de sa majesté de la Royne nostre souveraine, et pareillement de vous rendre ce a quoy je suys obligé. Et quant au premier, a ce que j'ay peu entendre par vostre dict chiffre, la depeche que Monsr de Mauvissier a envoyé a Mgr. Le Duc de Lorraine s'addressoyt a vous, comme j'espere vous serez trop mieux adverty par autre voye, et pour vous mettre hors de peine de ce que je vous promettoys plus amples nouvelles par mon dernier chiffre que je vous avoys escrit, environ ce mesme temps ne sont jamais parties de mes mains, de sorte qu'il n'y a rien perdu. Et quant a l'autre, je ne vous puys donner autre tesmoynage que ma parolle, laquelle, si Dieu plaist, vous trouveres tousjours veritable, vous suppliant tres humblement me faire cest faveur de croyre que je n'ay pas moins de bonne volonté de respondre, avec tout debvoyr, et comme je suis obligé infiniment a ce que doybs au service de sa dicte majesté, que vous avez de bonne et sincere affection de me le recommender si soingneusement, et la ou il vous plaira m'adviser en quoy je puysse adjouster quelque chose a icelle volonté, je le fayray de telle sorte que vous cognoystres, Dieu aydant, que je n'ay pas encores faulte d'entendement pour servir Dieu, honorer et reverer ma souverainne, comme vray et legitime magistrat de sa divine majesté, et obeyr, comme je suys obligé, a vos commandemens. Vous ne me mandes rien de vos affaires, encores que sachiez bien que je n'y ay nul advis d'ailleurs, qui est cause que je n'ay de quoy vous faire longue harangue, n'ayant aucun subject a quoy respondre. Toutes foys, je ne lesseray pas a vous mander que depuys que suys en Angleterre, je n'ay jamais trouvé sa majesté en melieure devotion en tout ce qui concerne vostre particulier, et mesmement sa majesté m'a dict depuys troys jours, que jamais elle n'avoyt pensé mettre ses seaux en autre main sinon pour se mettre hors de la tutele de fu Mgr. le Cardinal de Lorraine, et pour luy oster le moyen de disposer si librement de son bien, ce que sa majesté n'eust jamais peu faire en vostre temps, sans vous mettre en mauvays mesnage avec luy et peultestre au grand prejudice de tous ses autres affaires. Il y a bien deux ans que je vous ay escrit, et par expres commandement de sa majesté, que si vous pouviez

envoyer quelq'un des vostres en qui vous vous pourriez bien fier, sa majesté avoyt bonne volonté de vous esclaircir de beaucop de poyntz dont cest cy en estoyt l'un. Et derechef a present sa majesté estant en esperance que Mons. de Lugery aura pasport, m'a commandé vous escrire qu'elle desyre que quelqu'un des vostres, et en qui vous vous puyssiez bien fier, face le voyage avec luy pour le mesme effect. Dieu veulle que nous les puyssions veore aussy tost par de sa que la santé de sa majesté le requiert. Au rest, Monsieur, puysque c'est le bon plaisir de Dieu me donner plus de santé que je n'ay en par cydevant, dautant je m'efforceray a l'employer sincerement au service de sa majesté, qui est le plus agreable service pareillement que je pense vous pouvoyr faire, comme aussy je fayray tout ce qui sera en moy pour continuer ceux qui sont pres sa majesté en la bonne volonté et affection, qu'ilz vous portent, et ont tousjours porté, a ce que j'ay peu cognoystre. Il est bien vray que je ne puys juger de ce que les hommes ont dans le cœur, mais a ce qui est venu a ma cognoyscance, je n'ay jamais apperceu que personne quelconque par desa ayt seullement parlé de vous, sinon avec un respect deu, et a vostre honeur, si ce n'a este fu Monsr Raulet en ces derniers jours, et la ou j'eusse cogneu le contraire. Tout ainsy comme je seroys bien marry d'estre estimé rapporteur et boutefeu contre toute charité christienne, pareillement, ne suis je tant obligé a homme vivant que je voulleusse dissimuler avec luy a vos despens, ce que je vous ay bien voullu faire entendre pour vous supplier me faire ce bien, au cas que quelqu'un vous eust faict aucun rapport au contraire, de me reserver l'un oreille comme a celuy qui vous est le plus obligé, et moins vous vouldroyt deguiser la verité en tout ce qui vous touchera. Et comme je ne vous vouldroys laisser ignorer le mal s'il en avoyt, aussy ne vous veulx je cacher le bien ; et pour ceste cause je vous diray icy que j'ay veu des lettres de James Curll a son filz, ou entre beacop d'autres propos il escrit en telle sorte, et si en homme de bien de vous, que si vous aviez veu ses dictes lettres, et eussiez le moyen de luy faire aucun plaisir, vous jugeres sa bonne volonté le meriter ; sur quoy je ne vous diray autre chose, car n'avoy jamais eu occasion de doubter de vostre benevolence envers tous les

fidelles serviteurs de sa majesté, et scachant bien avec quel visage je vous ay veu autrefoys recepvoyr les ennemys mesmes de vostre nom et famille, pour le seul respect du service de sa dicte majesté. Je ne vous veulx importuner de plus longues lettres pour le present, ayant en assez de peine de vous mander ce que dessus en un chiffre manche et rappetace, comme celuy qui faict tout le mieulx qu'il peult. Au surplus, Monsieur, je n'ay, Dieu mercy, fault de rien, qui sera cause que, si Monsr Dolu m'offre de l'argent, je le remvoyeray a vous, sachant bien en quel estat vous pouvez estre, et quels hostes vous aves en Poictou. J'auray tousjours a honeur et tres grand contentement que vous vous servies de ce que sa majesté me don; et apres m'estre tres humblement recommandé a vos bonnes graces, je pry Dieu vous donner en santé longue et heureuse vie. De Chefeild ce λ : de ξ vostre plus obligé frere et bien affectionné serviteur de Betoun.

Monsieur le Secretaire, je vous ay escrit ce de en lettres ouvertes, auxquelles je n'ay rien a adjouster, sinon que je vous pry ne trouver mauvais que je vous ay advisé autrefoys de ce que je pense estre la mieulx pour vous et pour moy. Je ne puys estre amy et dissimulateur, mais si vous me voulles faire entendre en quoy je vous puysse faire plaisir, vous cognoystres que je n'ay pas faulte de bonne volonté. Vostre affectionné amy de Betoun.

Marked outside :

Reçu, le jour de Pasques, 1576.

No. 17.

The Queen to Archb^{r}. Beatoun.

Omitted in her majesty's letter — Labanoff, vol. iv. p. 300—after "bien humble service." La Royne commence a se malcontenter fort de son brouillon, et surtout de ce que £ il veulx gouverner ses affaires a sa fantasie sans y appeller que ceulx qui dependent de luy. Elle luy a desja escript par troys foys fort aigrement, et plus que devant, par sa derniere,

laquelle vous pouvez avoir veue dans le dernier pacquet que je vous ay addressé. Je n'oublie poinct a le servir de ce que je puis : mais d'autant que sa majesté ne veult faire paroistre la faulte qu'elle a faicte en l'election d'un tel homme, combien qu'elle la cognoisse assez a present, je ne puis parvenir a ce que je desirerois, et cependant je tasche de luy rongner les æsles de si pres qu'il demeure contant de sa charge sans s'entremectre de celles d'autruy. Vous aurez par Mons. Dolu de nouvelles instructions que j'ay dressées pour renverser l'ordre estably a la devotion du dict 7: et le remectre, s'il m'est possible comme il doibt estre, premierement pour le service de sa majesté, et en apres au contentement de tous ses bons et anciens amys. Mons. de Ross qui s'est acheminé a Rome, &c. [as in Labanoff].

No. 18.

Monsieur Arnault[1] to Archb^p^. Beaton.

Monseigneur, ces jours passez, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur receut de Monsieur de Walsingham deux pacquetz de la Royne d'Escosse, en l'un desquelz estoit encloz le present, qu'il vous envoye, accompaigné de celuy des officiers de sa majesté lequel (comme verrez par le cachet de Monsr de Walsingham qui y a esté mis) a esté ouvert. Et quant a vre dernier je le porte ces jours a la court, et devant que de rien cacheter et fermer, je voulu tout montrer et ouvrir a mon dict Sieur de Walsingham, ainsi que Monsr l'ambassadeur me l'avoit enchargé. Mais il ne voulut permettre que j'ouvrisse vostre pacquet, (qui n'estoit aucunement cacheté) ni nulle autre de nos lettres (comme il a de coustume) ains me le fit pleyer et cacheter pour l'envoyer ce jour la mesme a sa majesté, laquelle avoyt envoyé ung devant de coste et ung pourpoint en broderie fort bien elabouré a Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, pour le presenter de sa part a la Royne d'Angleterre, ce qu'il fit en son audience qu'il eut il y a troys jours, et luy presente aussy les lettres escrittes de la main de sa majesté

[1] Secretary to the French ambassador in London.

qu'elle receut fort volontiers. Monsr l'Ambassadeur a receu response des petitz pacquetz desquelz vous me mandiez estre en peine, et vous enverrez par la premiere asseurée commodité ce qui est pour vous. Je croy que vous avez bien entendu que le Sieur Garteley est detenu prisonnier en Escosse par le Regent, a l'instinct, comme il dict, de Monsr de Walsingham, qui luy escrivit que le dict Sieur Garteley avoit baillé en ceste ville copies du testament du conte Badouel, lequel estoit contre le dict Sieur Regent et contre son honneur. Il en a escrit a Monsr l'Ambassadeur pour interceder envers le dict Sieur de Walsingham, affin qu'il moyennast son relaschement. Le Sieur de Horsaye qu'avoit renvoyé la Royne d'Angleterre vers Dom Johan d'Austria, est retourné assez mal edifié, comme l'on dict, du dict Seigneur; tellement que l'on tient pour tout certain que la dicte Royne se declarera pour les estatz, et fera doresnavant arrester toutes les navvies des Espagnols qui vouldront passer ce destroit. Elle est fort picquée des indignitez qu'ont receu quelques uns de ses subjectz en la ville d'Anvers. On tient pour tout certain que la guerre est declarée d'une part et d'autre au dict Pays Bas. Monsr l'Ambassadeur a eu advis par ses derniers que sa Majesté se portoit bien, dont je loue Dieu, et le prie vous donner, Monseigneur, en tres parfaite santé heureuse et longue vie. De Londres, ce viij jour de Febvrier, 1577. Vostre bien humble et tres affectionné Serviteur. ARNAULT.

Madame de Mauvisiere est relevée de couche, et se porte bien. Elle m'a chargée de vous presenter ses bien affectueuses recommandations a vos bonnes graces.

Written in ordinary characters by a clerk. Signature and Postscript are autograph.

Thus addressed:

A Monseigneur Mgr l'Archevesque de Glasgo grand Aulmosnier, superintendant des affaires, et ambassadeur de la Royne d'Escosse, douairiere de France.

[1] Copies of Bothwell's will had found their way to London at this time. But they have now disappeared.

No. 19.

Lord Ogilvy to Archb^r. Beatoun.

I wreit to your Lordship in *J.* with Jhon Fischer sic discurs as I culd lerne for that tyme, quha promeist to me that gif he cum not himself with thay letters, he suld cause thame be [du]ly delyvrit to your Lordship, and as yit I knaw not gif they be cum to your handis or not. My estait has yit contineuit efter the samin sort as I wreit to you, excep only be the solistation of mony nobilmen being at the mariage and banket in Glasgo of my Lord r—ov[1] dochter with the Maister of Eglintoun, I gat my ward transportit furth of Glasgo nearer my ovn to Sanct Andrews, quhair as yit I remane, and in my cumming furth of Glasgo com be Edinburgh, quhair I spak with my Lord Regent,[2] and be his langage he apperit to be in your Lordship guid wil & favour, lyk as he had schawin to your umqhyl cusing Maister Stevin, quhom to he had committit sum credit to haue bein reportit to your Lordship, gif God had permittit him dayis to have spoken to you; and continuis as yit in the samin, as apperis to me. He spak very reverendly and with gryt honour of the Queen, protesting befor his God he wald not do her evil, nor consent thairto for all the geir of the world; and gif the king his maister inlakit, as God forbeid, he wald seik be all moyans to have of hir succession to occupy hir roum, and wald rather serve hir and hir race, nor ony of the warld, as God was his juge. And fordair, quhair sum calumniat him that he had maid promes of the King hir son to England, he took on his conscience that he was als free of any promes towards the Queen of England, on that behalf, as ony man that was on the Queens faction or on that syde, as tym suld gif experience. I did reply onto him, quhilk was over lang to trouble your Lordship with; but his conclusion in general was, as apperit to me, that gif he war suir that the Queen wald forgait and put in oblivion thingis past, as alsua a. to beir him guid wil, that he wald do all thingis that lay into him for restoring of the Queen's majesty

[1] Rothes.

[2] The Earl of Morton.

to hir former estait and honour, & said forder he wald be able to delyver her the maist pairt of her jowellis, and quhair ony wantit, to schaw in quhais handis they war; and eftir I cum heir to Sanct Andrews, Sir James Balfour cum to me, quha assureitly apperis to beir the Queen's majesty as guid will as evir he did, and he has gryt credit at the Regent's handis. He did assure me al this that the Regent spak to me to be al treu, and reportit the samin in affect, and mekil mair, and how that he had wretin and causit wryt this samin to your Lordship, regratand hevelie that na ansour cam agane.[1] I resonit hardly with Sir James, sayand how culd that be proponit to the Queen's majestee or to your Lordship, in respect the regent had so gryt moyan with England, and wold not schak thame of; quha ansorit that the regent and he had bein in hand with that befoir; sayand that that was the hie way to his destruction, he not being assurit of the Queen's gud wil nor yet of a. quhilk gif he war, other be hir awin letter or youris in hir name, send to me or ony uther hir gud frindis heir; that that suld not be long to do, and wald be content with gud wil to leif under hir majestie and hir son, only Erle of Morton in his awin rank and to cleith him with s. and hir, and to gif hir and thame perfyt pruif of his services. Sir James thinkis that gif sik ane mater micht be brocht about without trouble in this cuntray, it war the gretest honour & weil that evir your Lordship or ony uthir Scottisman did in our dayis. I assur your Lordship that Sir James is yit extreimly haitit be al theis that war aganis the Queen, except the Regent only; and in my opinioun he has gud resoun to do al that he don to furthir hir cause. For he has na assurance bot be hir; and I belief your Lordship may credeit him in this mater. Gif this be treulie menit as it is spokin, your Lordship hes sum guid mater to work on, be this, & be the uthir letter send to you with Jhon Fischer, quhairin I did mention sum thingis of theis about the king, sic as Argyle and utheris; be the quhilkis twa letteris ye may easely se the estait of the cuntray. This is ane mater that wald be wyselie lukit upon, as I doupt not bot your Lordship wil, & to tak the best of thir twa. Thair is ane gryt contradiction betwix the first letter & this heir. This

[1] See the letters of Mr Beaton of Balfour, Nos. 12, 13, and 14.

offring requiris, savand your wyser jugement, ane gud ansour. Alwais, howsoevir your Lordship wil that I use me, or with quhom ye think that I sal deil, I sal go fordward with it. I am grytly pressit for ane ansour at your Lordship's hand, for thay belief that I have that credit with your Lordship. I wald request you, gif ye think it guid, that ye suld send sum gud letter to be schawin to the Regent or to Sir James Balfour, and ane uther appert to myself, how ye wil me to wirk; and I sal execut the sam with als gud hert, be Godis grace, as your Lordship wil advyse me to do. I have bein veray evil handlit, and yit na beter as the J⁻ can schaw, marie gif I may wirk to bring about hir service and forderance, I cair not. I assuir your Lordship efter the returning of your gud ansour baith the Queen, that kingdom and your Lordship wil be socht be all moyane, and sum freind send to your Lordship to that ◇ Assuridlie I wryt nathing but that I am ernestly desyrit to do. For as your Lordship hes had ane gud opinion of me, sa sal I merit sa far as sal ly into me to lat you knaw al thingis that I may lern not only that, bot to hasard my lyf and al that may follow thairon to gif you perfyt experience gud wil I have to do your Lordship service, and nevir to change sa lang as I leif. As ony forder occasion serves your Lordship sal be adverteist.[1]

Marked on the back:

Letter of my Lord Ogylvy, send wt David Balfour, & resavit the xvt of Apryll, 1577.

No. 20.

Lord Ogilvy to Archbp. Beatoun.

I have ressavit your leter the last of 12 quhairin ye find you evil informit from heir; and specialy sen I com out of ward, the quhilk indeid is treu, bot yit the falt was not altogader in me. For ð, and your man Brus promessit to mè to mak you informit fra tym to tym as materis fel furthe. Bot your Lordship sal not find sic falt wytht me in tym cum-

[1] The offers of Morton and Balfour contained in this letter are very remarkable.

ing, God wiling. I trest Athol sal send sum man to you wytht his ful intentioun. He thinkis to be doin be your advyce with this afflictit kingdom; and hes nathing les in mynd nor that thing your Lordship thinkis, that theis heir suld esteim of your Lordship's inhabilati and capassati, quhilk assuritly thay esteim mair wirthy nor ony heir that can traffyk wyth your Lordship, and wil depend on your wisdoum and cunsel be ony man lifand, tuiching our weil and kingdom. As conserning the rest that followis in your letter, tuiching the protestation your Lordship makis, as I luif your lyf and honour, quhilk assuritlie is als deir to me as my awin, or than I war not wirthy to leif, in respec of sa guid caus, as I and myn has resavit of you, that I culd not bey advertisar of that quhilk folowit in your leter. Your Lordship may weil be assurit nevir word nor deid sal cum throw me to your hurt, Immediatelie efter the resseit of your letter, I passit to the Earl of Athol, quha incontinent send to the Earl of Argyle, to attend on that man that is to cum, quha hes promessit to do the same secretli and weil. For Argyle knawis not this to proceed from your Lordship, but only of Athol, quha lykwayis fand it not guid that I suld communicat it to ð, in respect of his residence that he makis at Striveling. War not that I wis ye beter acquintit with this scifer, I had not gotin it red; ther was mony wrang letteris in it. Athol findis the man that is cuming very guid, and his opinioun is that he wald vyse him openli to declair befor the King and Cunsel his commissioun, and deil privatly with sic utheris as he hes to do wythal. For he hes ane fair grund to desyr the reparatioun of rompeure of the peis betwin the twa cuntrayis. Ther wil be ane man gotin that has beyth the Latin and Franche for that. Now, as to the estait of this Cuntray, ther hes né alteration hapnit sen our beying at the Fakirk, and I dout not bot ye haif hard of the meiting that hes bein sen syn at the kyrk of Enviresk, and at Leith. I was chosin to haif bein ane of the ressounaris of that mater, bot I had sic adu that I mycht not be at it. As also for sic uther causis as I wil lat your Lordship knaw. I was ane coumunar at our agriance in Stirviling, and did send your Lordship the hedis of our capitilation ather be Brus or Schaw. Theis about the King

dois al that they can to wrak us inderecly that was at the Fakirk. For thay haif gyfen Coldenknowis ofyce of Wardanry to the Laird Woderburin; lykwyis ⊓ ofyce of wardenry to ⊓ and I feir in schort tym yeung Sesfuird sal pas be the sam. Ther is nevir action now that comes befor the cunsel of Stirveling, bot it is tein away be the pluralaty of votis, how godly or ressonabil that evir it be. The bordors, be Mortonis moyan, is heil brokin, also the hilandis, to the effec he may be calit ane guid governour in his tym; and yet theis that hes doin the sam was in his keiping, quhan he demittit the autority, and sen syn he hes latin thaim gang free to truble the cuntray. Ther was ane privy moyan meid latly to haif tein the toun of Edinbroth be slycht, and thay to haif commandit the castel, quhilk was esaly doin, and therefter to haif retirit the King to Edinbroth. Bot this enterprys was decuverit, and sen syn thay haif mand the steipil, and hes four hundreth men in wach nychtly, and markis to leif on ther gardis for ane tym. I trest ye haif hard the Bishop of Ketnes was meid Eirl of Lennox for twa causis; ane that Monsur de Aubanye[1] suld not cum in Scotland to seik the rycht of the hous of Lennox, the uther, he being Eirl of Lennox and the King's Unkil, suld mak him aganis us. Alwayis, Athol hes mereyit ane dāachter of his on him, that he may proffeit thaim nathing. The esteit of this cuntray standis in ane mervelus evil kase. God for his mersy to help it! I mynd to reteir my Son James heim schortly, gyf it be your Lordship's plesur. The causis quhy I wil not truble your Lordship now, but sal cause David Balfour declair to you the heil circumstansyis of al at lynth. Sa efter my humil commendations of service to your Lordship, I commit your Lordship most hartly to Godis' protection. At Boleschin the 26 day of *2*

Monsuiar Aubenye, Athol and Argyle writis that Maister Jhon Lindsay gat to bring in Scotland, himself derikit on the back to Morton, for feir thay suld be tein in England. Ane frind quha resavit his leteris befor his cuming in Scotland, hes send that packet to Mortun. I wat not gyf he hes resavit tham, but youris is weil quhaevir be beraris.

[1] Esmé Stewart Lord of Aubigny.

No. 21.

GEORGE DOUGLAS to ARCHBP. BEATOUN.

I haif resavit your Lordship's letter of the 20 of Mersche. It is treu that it com not to my handis til within this sax daies. Incontinent thaireftir I maid my onkil and ⊂ participant thairof. If it hed com schouner to our handis your Lordship micht haif hed schouner ansour. In the men tym I thocht it neseser to lat you onderstand the reset thairof by this present berer, of quhais fideliti I wil ansur your Lordschip, and als particularly to inform you of the present esteit of our cuntry, abyding til your Lordschip may be foullily ansurit of your letter, quhilk sal be schortly, God willing, ethir bi Wilyem Schaw, or sic othir as theis nobilmen think expedient, quhom to ye haif wretin and send credit. For my pert, I sal spour them with sic diligens as is posibil acordin to the tym, quhilk is veri trubilsoum, and in special ⊓ ⊂ hard handling, quhais ansur the heil rest depends opon. I wil asur you my onkil and he remanis constant, in sort that if al the Lords of Scotland sould abandoun our Mestres caus, and hir majestis sons servis, thay wil hauld ferme, providing thay may do the sam that is be help of France. I wil not insist presently on this meter, til your Lordschip resave ansur of your letteris, to the quhilk tym I remit al othir thingis to the berer quhom I haif sufficiently instructit. I hoip yit that thir Lordis do soum goud, albeit thay haif bein ovir slaw in bygenis, to the scheim and disonor of that treson committit in Stirling, and to the weil of them that menit and menis nathing bot the weil of our Mestres, and preservation of hir majestie's son. This eftir my most houmil commendation of servis comits your Lordschip in Goddis protexion. From Glendowik, the twentie aucht day of July, your Lordschip's at powar to do your servis. GEOURGE DOUGLAS.

My bedfalow hes hir humil servis comendit to your Lordschip.

No. 22.

After "Escript a Chatsworth le quinzieme Septembre," on p. 66, vol. v., of Labanoff, the following Postscript by Nau is omitted:

Ce qui suict est de Nau. Monseigneur, je n'ajouteray a ceste cy qu'un bien humble remerciment de ce qu'il vous a pleu dernierement m'escripre mesmement pour mon particulier, dont ayant fait ouverture suyvant vostre advis a la Royne, elle m'a demonstré ne l'avoir aucunement agréable. Je le respecte, oùltre le respect de son service, à cause que les affaires de mon frere le tresorier eussent bien requis ma presence, pour un temps par dela, et mon indisposition mesme. Voyla comment je demeure prisonnier, avec plus de volonté que de moyen de vous satisfaire en tout ce qui concernera vostre service par de ça, vous priant m'excuser de ce qui passe audessus de mes forces. Au reste, vous me trouverez tousjours tel que je vous ay protesté. Le manque du payement de ce que vous avez advancé a Monsr de Fernyherst me gardera une aultre foys de m'engaiger, par aucun ordre en faveur de qui que ce soit, et lorsqu'il adviendra, ce sera de sorte que j'en puisse repondre. Sur ce, vous baisant tres humblement les mains, je prieray Dieu qu'il vous aye en sa sainte garde. J'ay honte de vous rendre la reponse qui m'a esté donné sur ce que je m'estois advancé de remonstrer de vostre estat et grande necessité. On m'a dict que doresnavant vous jouiriez paisiblement de votre abbaye, que vous aviez amandé d'une bonne somme d'argent comptant, par la mort de feu Monsr vostre frere, et que retranchant, comme vous me mandez avoir delibéré ce que vous aviez acoustume de departir du vostre aux uns et aux aultres, vous aviez de quoy attendre un meilleur estat des affaires de sa majesté, veu sa necessité presente. Elle a esté infiniment offensée de ce que luy a escript ö touchant ce qu'il dist qu'on a voul attempter çontre luy, ou l'on vous charge de n'avoir esté si prompt à l'assister de vostre faveur, à en avoir la raison que les circonstances du fait le requerirent. Le reste est pour Monsr Chas-

teau. Monsieur et frere, je vous prie faire tenir à mon beaufrere, M. de Ruisseau, le petit pacquet cy encloz marquée |Δ|, et en recompense faites estat de moy, comme de celuy qui est entierement vostre. Je me suis servis de ce que vous m'avez escript pour confirmer sa majesté en la panse qu'elle a en vostre service, et luy lever le malcontantement que cydevant elle en pourroit avoir receu. Le reste est de la Royne a Mgr de Glasgo.

Mgr de Glasgo. Faites delyvrer, &c.

No. 23.

Bruce to Arch^p. Beaton.

Monseigneur, Je vous ay ecrit l'unzieme d'Aoust, par le maistre de mon navire, que Guillaume Acman connoit bien, auquel j'ay addressé mes lettres pour vous estre envoyées, en quel estat j'ay trouvé ce pays a mon arrivée, et comme je m'estois gouverné avec les Contes Argyl et Athol. Je vous ay aussi amplement ecrit par Maitre Thomas Levingstone, le vingtiesme du dict mois, leur responce a tous les pointz de mes instructions, dont de jour en jour ils demandent la vostre sur la volonté de leurs majestez; en quoy je leur ay promis qu'ilz seront bientost satisfaitz, et en ceste esperance, ilz ne m'ont point voulu laisser partir encores d'icy, principallement Monseigneur d'Athol, qui est d'advis que j'attende l'arrivée de l'ambassadeur qui sera envoyé par deça, de la part de leurs dictes majestez, le depart duquel il vous supplie solliciter et haster en toute diligence, comme il vous ecrit particulierement lui mesmes par sa lettre, ecrite sur le dos d'une petite ligne en chiphre, laquelle il m'a bailée a Dumkel apres mon retour de Blair en Athol, ou je le suis alle trouver ces jours passez. Madame sa femme vous ecrit aussi la lettre cy enclose, marquée ainsi (‡‡) et a la majesté de la Royne notre Souveraine et maistresse la ainsi suscritte (ℝ) et ceste autre (𝒩) a Ψ. De toutes lesquelles il est tres necessaire de recevoir les responces, pour les encourager au service de sa dicte majesté, et pour tenir le fer chaud, tandis qu'il est au feu.

Car, sur mon Dieu, la constente integrité de mon dict Seigneur Athol, au service de Dieu, de sa Souveraine, et de leurs majestés Chrestiennes est admirable, veu le travail et grand fardeau qu'il soustient, et les embusches qui continuellement luy sont dressées. Il est autant ou plus François que Escossois, et en retient les Contes d'Argyl et ↑, avec plusieurs autres des plus grand Seigneurs a la devotion de leurz dictes majestez tres Chrestiennes, attendant vos nouvelles de leur intention et volonté envers eux. Je ne le voulu quitter qu'il ne feut party de Domkel vers Edinburgh, ou il arriva Dimanche dernier, pour obvier aux menées du conte de Morton, qui s'esforçoit d'attirer a sa devotion le chasteau et la ville par ses partisans, qui y demeurent jusques au nombre de trente. Il a offert dix mil marckz a la femme d'Alexandre Arsking. Apres le departe du Conte d'Athol de Dumkel, qui fut Samedy dernier, je m'acheminay a Castel Cambel, où, à mon arrivée, qui fut le Lundy ensuivant, Monsieur le Conte d'Argyl ne faisoit que venir de Stirling. Il me receut humainement, et me dict qu'il avoit disné le jour precedent avec le Roy, qui ne peut avoir qu'une bonne opinion, malgré tous les mauvais q: ꝙ que ses adversaires font a son prejudice; au surplus qu'il peut entrer en son quartier quant il veult; mais il attend que le Conte de Morton s'en soit premierement en allé, selon sa promesse. Pour a quoy donner bientost ordre, je le persuaday et priay au nom du dict Conte d'Athol, de l'aller trouver incontinent á Edinbrogh, ou il arriva avant hier avec Monsieur ↑, qui à la requeste du dict Conte d'Athol ne l'a pas abandonné un seul jour, horsmis celuy qu'il fut a Stirling depuis le dernier appointement, fait au mois d'Aoust avec ceux de la maison de Mar et leurs adherens, qui taschent au possible d'attirer et gaigner la bonne grace du dict Conte d'Argyle. Mais pour obvier a tel inconvenient, et pour l'entretenir a sa devotion, le dict Conte d'Athol a fait tousjours tenir avec luy, comme dict est, le dict ↑, attendant vostre responce sur la volonté de leurs dictes majestèz, laquelle si l'on differe, le dict Conte d'Athol sera contraint de succomber sous le faiz, et en abandonnant le tout, s'en aller par dela, comme il a esté de longtemps, et est encores resolu et délibéré. Le dict Conte d'Argyle promect d'entretenir notre dict prince a la devotion de la Royne sa

mere, comme s'est efforcé estant dernierement à Stirling. Mais notre dict prince, a la persuasion des gens qui sont alentour de luy, commenca un jour a redarguer Madame la Contesse d'Argyl sa femme, qui avoit demeurée quelque temps auparavant pres de luy, pour preparer la voye a son dict mary, de ce qu'elle le persuadoit d'entretinir division en son royaume, et l'empeschoit de se joindre avec ceux de la maison de Mar et adherens, qui travailloyent pour sa preservation et liberté. A quoy elle respond, qu'il ne pouvoit etre trop assurée parmy ses ennemis et ceux du bien public, ny aussi en liberté estant enfermé dedans un chasteau, et au reste, qu'il n'y avoit femme au monde, exceptee une seule, qui l'aimoit tant qu'elle. Et luy ayant demandé laquelle c'estoit, elle repliqua, la Royne vostre mere, qui vous estime son seul joyau, et supernaturellement vous ayme plus que sa propre vie. Des qu'elle eust répliqué ceci, il se souris, et l'ayant salué doucement se retire d'avec elle. Elle m'a jure que, moyennant l'aide de Dieu, son mary ne demeurera pas huict jours au chasteau de Stirling, que par finesse, ou par force, il ne se face maistre du chasteau et de la personne du Prince, qui par la trop grande liberté qu'il a eu ces moys passez, est devenu fort superbe et grand dissimulateur, et craint on qu'il ressemble à ses pere et grandpere, principallement en la cruauté et peu de jugement. Mon dict Seigneur Conte d'Athol m'a dict plus de vingt foys qu'il vouldroyt avoir perder tout son bien moyennant, que nostre dict prince et luy passent tous deux en France. Trois jours apres mon arrivée en ce pays, les ministres d'Edinburgh luy demanderent sur sa conscience, s'il n'avoit point des intelligences en France, et si je ne luy avois apporté lettres; il les pria de croire que non. Neantmoins cela ne les a empeschez de me soupsonner a cause de vous, et de ma religion, et pour la mesme cause je suis autant suspect au Conte de Morton et ses complices, qui tasche de me faire nuire, dont j'eu advertissement par Monsr d'Airth et mon =, qui m'envoyerent chacun un gentilhomme avant mon depart vers le pays d'Athol. Depuis mon dict Seigneur le Conte d'Athol m'a avoué pour sien, disant m'avoir receu pour gouverner son fils, et m'excuse de mes voyages par le pays sur ce que je va

visiter mes parens et amis, a cause de ma longue absence en France. Monseigneur, je vous ay supplié par mes premieres, comme je faiz encores a present, d'advancer a Maistre Thomas Levingstone soixante six escus sol desquelz, Dieu aydant, je vous rembourseray a mon retour par de la. Car j'y ay autant entre les mains d'un quidam qui ne s'en deschargera point jusques a mon retour. J'espere, Monseigneur, que je ne seray point esconduict de ma requeste. Le Conte de Morton envoya lettres du roy a Edinburgh pour faire eslire un prevost a sa devotion; mais le Conte d'Athol, qui s'estoit achemine, tant pour assister au retour de messieurs du parlement, qu'a l'election du dict prevost, leur remonstra qu'en obeissant aux dictes lettres on introduisoit une nouvelle coustume en la ville, leur ostant la liberté d'eslire leur prévost et eschevins, de sorte que celuy de ceste année passée a esté retenu, et les eschevins esleuz a la devotion du dict Conte d'Athol. Il y a plus de troys semaines que Guillaume Schaw eust sa depesche du Conte d'Athol, et tousjours depuis il a demeuré au Chasteau de Stirling. Le dict Conte d'Athol, à toute peine empescha le Conte d'Argyle d'aller demeurer au dict Chasteau, parceque Morton y est encores. Le dict Argyle est trop facile, et totalement gouverné par sa femme, qui est soupsonnée de hayr la Royne, et de favoriser et d'avoir intelligence avec le dict Morton. Neantmoins, à ce que j'ay peu colliger de ses propos mesmes, c'est pour attrapper le dict Morton, et se faire Maistre du dict Chasteau, et de la personne du Prince. Pour faire appointement, on a proposé le mariage du ♀ avec la fille du feu Conte de Morray et de ma dicte dame d'Argyle. Maistre Jhan Provan retournera bientost a ⊓ mais je ne scay à quelle fin. J'ay moyen de faire dire et proposer ce que vous vouldrez a nostre Prince. Mon beaupere est mallade jusques à l'extrémité, par quoy il vous supplie tres humblement vouloir prier la Royne d'accorder ce qui luy est deu de ses gaiges au proffit de sa femme, et de ses enfans, qui sont depossedez de leurs moyens et heritages pour le fidelle service qu'il a faict à sa majesté. Le Sieur Bruce, qui faict le devoir d'un bon subject et serviteur de sa Maistresse, pres le Conte d'Argyle et autres Seigneur de ce pays, s'en alloit en ⛰ si je ne l'eusse retenu sur l'esperance de la liberalité de sa majesté. Vos

detteurs m'ont promis de vous satisfaire bientost, ce que je solliciteray dilligemment.

Maintenant Monsieur est //, je vous supplieray me tenir es bonnes graces de monseigneur et de vous; et assurer Monsieur Melville de la bonne santé de ses amis par de ça, le priant en mon nom de me ramentevoir souvent a sa majesté, avec protestation que je ne me lasseray pas de luy faire humble et fidelle service, s'il luy plaist me tesmoigner sa bonne volonté par quelque bienfait a sa discretion. A petit Lith, ce cinquiesme Octobre, huict. Vostre humble Serviteur.

Marked outside:—

Bruce, recu le viij Nov^re 1578.

No. 24.

Lord Ogilvy to Arch^r. Beatoun.

I resavit your æ the twelt of *4*, as lykways the Queenis alphabet to me, & ane letter to be given to the king. I delyverit the same immediatly after the resait thairof within his cabinet, nane present bot my Lord of Lennox, quha behuvit to knaw thairof. The king lykit veray weil of the ☊ & findis it treu by experience in mony pointis, til have bein practisit heir, gif God had not discoverit & stoppit thair ungodly mening; lyk as I dout not bot your Lordship hes pairtly heard or now. Specially be the detention of Morton, quha, I belief sal schortly get his conding recompence; as lykwayis the eschewing of Maister Archibald Douglas, quha remanis presently in Berwik. Gif I suld entir in discurs upon the craftis that Randel hes usit in this kingdom, as in suting Morton's libertie, & to disgrace my Lord of Lennox be counterfeitit letteris,[1] as wretin be you and the Bischop of Ros to some Cardinaillis of Rome, as lykwayis from thame to you, & that, be my Lord of

[1] He refers to the counterfeit letters produced by Randolph, and which Bowes admitted to be forged.—See p. 218 of this volume.

Lennox intelligence with you & thame was hail til subvert the religion, be the quhilkis he culd not find ane moyen sa proper til move the hail kirk and ministris agans him, as be that, the quhilk apirandly had succedit to Randel's mening, gif God had not preventit it be the taking of Quhittingeam and George Afflek, quha planly hes schawin that sic letteris and inventions war maid in Berwik be Maister Archibald Douglas, Bows, & uthairs, and send in heir to Randel, it war langsum. The murthour of the kingis father is able to be tryit schortly, as lykwys the poisoning of the Erle of Athol. As to the taking of the kingis self, it is plane that he suld have bein delyverit in England. With the circumstances thairof God hes bein very favorabil til him, & til us that dependis treuly upon him. Ye king is rathir inclynit to France nor to Spain, for ony argumentis consavit ather in the letter, or that I culd gif him, quhairfor they suld in my opinion meit it, gif his neid requyr, quhilk aperis to be gryt, bot, God willing, his body sal be preservit from thame, albeit thay may weil owerharle ane part of kis hingdom. I gif you maist humble thankis that, amangis mony uthir gud benifits, hes movit the Quene til tak sua gud opinion of me, as to gif me sa gryt credit betwix hir & hir son. I sal deserve sa far as sic ane puir man of my estait may, in treuth & honesty, as hir majestie & your Lordschip sal knaw be experience. The king hes als gryt lyking of his mother as ony son can have, and ane very gud lyking of your Lordship also. I have brunt, as ye commandit, the chipher letter & al befor the berar. I wil beseik your Lordship to continew your wonted favour to me, as your Lordship sal have power to command me to my lyfis end. It wil pleis you to cause convoy this uthair tickat to the Queenis majestie, quhilk is bot schort, in respect that I have wretin to your Lordship. At Edinburg, the saxteint of April, 1581.[1] Your Lordship's maist obedient d'Ogilvy.

Marked outside:—

Reçaved, the xxiij of May, 1581.

[1] Morton was at this time a prisoner in Dumbarton Castle awaiting his trial.

No. 25.

THE DUKE OF LENNOX[1] to ARCHBr. BEATOUN.

Le de ce moys je receu la lettre envoyée par ce porteur, laquelle je montray au roy, qui a esté fort aisé de scavoir que la Royne sa mere l'a en si grande recommendation; dont il l'en a voullu remercier par sa lettre, que je vous envoye avec une que j'escrips ausi a sa majesté, par laquelle je fais response a tous les points de celle envoyée P: datée de du , dont je suis certain qu'elle recepvra contentement, car elle voyra par là la grande affection que son bon filz luy porte, laquelle je vous jure sur mon honneur, l'avoir congnue tousjours estre tres grande. Et pour vous dire en abrégé le contenu de ma dicte lettre, le roy est resolu que malgré tout le monde il veult recongnoytre sa mere, l'aymer, l'honnorer, et la respecter, comme Dieu le luy commande de faire, et d'ensuyvre son conseil en tous ses affaires, et supporter et assister ceulx d'Engleterre qui sont affectionnés a son service en tout ce qu'il luy sera possible. Il est content de renouveler les ansiennes alliances, avec la France, et mesme par mariage, mais il n'a nulle volonté a l'Espaigne. Quant a la faction de Hontigton, c'est chose dont j'avois ésté adverty par elle, il y a desja pres d'ung an. Il supplye ausi sa bone mere que par moyen il soit appelé roy par les roys etrangers, à la charge qu'il luy sera obeissaht en tout ce qu'il luy plaira de commander, et la supplye ausi qu'il puise estre aydé de quelque argent et pouldre, ce qui est tres necessaire; mais il fault que cela se face secretement et dilligemment. Il remercie Monsr de Guise de sa bonne volonté, le suppliant de la luy vouloir continuer, et que si l'ong luy faict la guerre, qu'il luy veulle secourir, et d'estre procureur vers le roy, pour luy d'avoir son assistance. Car il est resolu de prendre son support de sa majesté d'ycy en avent, et ausy il prie Mons. de Guise de s'asurer qu'il l'ayme comme son bon parent et amys. Je luy avoit dict, comme il m'avoit par Lucrois, qu'il luy vouloit envoyer les chevaulx d'Ytalye. Il en a esté tres aise, et les recepvera de tres bon cuer. Mais si Mons. de Guise luy

[1] Esmé Stewart.

escript, je vous supplye qu'il le nome roy, car aultrement ses letres ne seront pas receues, et sy cela le mecontentera beaucoup, et sy cest chose qui ne peult en rien offenser la Royne sa mere. Quant aulx deportemens de deça, Randel qui estoit icy ambassadeur de la Royne d'Angleterre, a fort urgé la liberté de Morton, et a trafiqué avec le Conte d'Angous pour prendre les armes, de telle façon que le dict Angous s'est rendu rebelle, et sera bientost forfaict. Il a esté delaissé de beaucoup qui luy avoit promis assistance. Le procés de Morton sera bientost parachevé au contentement de la Royne d'Escosse, comme j'espère. Le dict a montré icy une copie de lettre qu'il disoit etre de vous, qu'aviez escript a Rome, par laquelle il me pensoit disgracier, parceque la dicte lettre faisoit mention que j'estois entré en practique avec 10: et 4: pour entreprendre contre la religion en ce pays, et ausi contre le royaume, et en a montré ausy une aultre de Mons. de Rosse. Mais le Roy ayant par soupeçon faict prendre prisonnier Quhittingem, il a confessé que son frere Maistre Archibald Douglas avoit contrefaict les dictes lettres, dont Maistre Bowis, qui estoit icy Ambassadeur pour la Royne d'Angleterre au mois de Septembre passé, en est participant, et qu'ilz les avoient envoyez à la Royne d'Angleterre, faignients qu'elles avoient esté interceptées par les chemins; et ausi m'a voulu accuser que j'avois voulu transporter le Roy hors de ce pays, et pensoit par cestes calumnies me faire aller hors d'aupres de mon petit maistre, lequel m'a tant faict d'honneur de tenir mon bon droict, que le dict Randol s'en est retourné, sans avoir peu obtenir ce qu'il demandoit. Et pensions qu'a son partement les Anglois, qui sont sur les frontiers jusques a ♀ ou ♀̈ mil hommes, tant de pied que de cheval, dusent entrer et se ralier avec aucquuns, les traistres et amys de Morton et Angous, mais ilz ne l'ont point faict encorres, et puisqu'ilz ont tant demeuréz, qu'ilz ne nous feront pas sitost la guerre, combien que pour cela nous ne laissons a nous tenir sur noz gardes. Or sy a la fin nous avons la guerre, (laquelle je vous puis asurer qu'elle ne commencera pas de nostre costé) c'est chose impossible que le Roy puise resister, s'il n'a secours de France; parquoy je vous supplye d'en advertir la Royne et Monsr de Guise, afin que s'il ayme

la preservation de la mere et du filz, qu'il y preigne garde. Car la conservation de l'ung conserve l'autre, et s'il pouvoit tant faire (sy cela avient) d'avoir du Roy de France g: n/o hommes de pied, avec quelqu'argent et pouldre, pour estre envoyé icy ausytost qu'ilz en recepvront l'advertisement. Je m'assure que toute Escosse ne nous scauroit que faire. Car quant a Angous, et a tous les amys de Mortón, ilz ne scauroient mettre tous ensemble g 60 chevaulx, et sy cela advient, je le supplye qu'il donne le commandement a mon cousing de Chemault, qui est icy avec moy, pour les amener, lequel ausytot que Morton sera depesché, partira pour s'en aller en France tout expres. Il servira beaucoup mieulx en cela, que nul aultre en la France, d'autant qu'il est cognu de tous les Seigneurs, et a l'honneur d'estre fort apuié du Roy. Vous communiquerez (s'il vous plaist) ceste lettre a Monsr de Guise, auquel je baise tres humblement les mains, et le supplye de croire que je luy demeureray tous jours tres humble serviteur. Quant a votre part, sa majesté est fort aise de vostre bone volonté, et vous prie de la continuer, ayent pris en fort bone part l'offre que luy faictes de votre service.

Je vous envoye une licence du Roy pour Tomas Weirdy, lequel je vous supplye de faire venir icy en toute diligence, d'autant que c'est luy qui a acheté le poison dont feu le Conte d'Athol a esté empoysoné.[1] Assurez le qu'il ne recepvera aucun mal, car l'on ne veult rien de luy que sa deposition, et si je luy fairay avoir de quoy vivre toute sa vie, et quand il viendra, qu'il s'en viene me trouver en quelque bien que je sais. Ausy je l'assure qu'il ne sera recherché des ministres, et s'il veult en apres s'en retourner en France, il le faira a sa volonté, et que ceci se face en toute diligence; et s'il veult, il ne bougera d'avec moy ou avec Madame d'Athol.

Outside:—

De Mons. le Conte de Lenox du xviij Avril, 1581, par Grendiston, le xxij May, 1581, a Paris.

[1] It thus appears that it was intended at this time to charge Morton with the murder of the Earl of Atholl.

No. 26.

DON BERNARDINO DE MENDOZA to ARCHBP. BEATOUN.

Monseigneur, combien que je n'ay receu jusques a cette heure reponse de celles que je vous ay escrit avec les lettres de la Royne d'Escosse, ay entendu par une de Robert Personio de 15 May estre arrivés a vous mains, et aussi avoir ésté cause ce que vous ay dict sur l'offre que le Prince de Parme escrivoit luy avoir este faict par Guillaume Criton, de faire nouvelle communication sur les affaires qui par avant estoient resolues avec Mons. le Duc de Guise. Ce qui me deplait grandment, et aussi qu'il donnera occasion de penser le Duc de Guise que le Roy mon maistre estoit refroidi en telle negociation, et moy elongé de les soliciter, chose qu'est bien au contraire. Car n'estant arrivé par alors a mes mains les lettres, par lesquelles ay entendu depuis ce que vous et Mons. le Duc de Guise et les aultres avez trouvé bon, selon l'estat en que se trouvent pour le present les affaires d'Escosse, n'estant possible obtenir la conversion du dict roiaume d'Escosse, sans faire ensemble celle d'Angleterre, ne trouverez etrange, et aussi M. le Duc de Guise que je sentirois que le Roy mon Maistre entenderoit tant de varietes en le restablissement de la vraie religion Catholique en Escosse, me pouvant culper que je n'entendisse l'estat des dictes affaires, et intention des Seigneurs de l'Escosse, puisque je luy escrivois tant diversement, et que cela seroit cause de delayer notre fin; a raison de quoy j'ay escrit ce que vous ay dict en la mienne sur ce point. Combien que je n'ay grand entendement, ny aussi longue experience des matieres d'estat, comme il seroit besoing pour discourir en entreprinses de si grand poids je congnois toutes fois, avec mon peu de jugement, qu'il sera bien difficile pouvoir finir la conversion d'Escosse, sans achever aussi celle d'Angleterre, et que telles affaires ne se peuvent pas parachever, sans plus grand nombre de soldats de ceulx quilz demandent au Pape et au Roy de secours. Sur quoy je vous puis assevrer que j'ay faict de ma part ce qui m'a esté possible, escrivant ainsi au Roy comme au Pape, recommen-

dant ceste entreprinse et la bonne occasion qui s'offre, laquelle passée, difficilement en long temps se recupereroit une autre. Et sur cela j'ay depeché un courier expres, et pour le present je depeche un aultre, rescrivant a Madrid comme a Rome ce que je vous ay bien voulu dire, et vous prier de signifier a Mons. le Duc de Guise, faisant mes tres affectueuses recommendations de ma part, l'assurant sur la foy de gentilhomme et soldat, que le commandement que j'ay et tiens du Roy mon maistre, depuis que je suis en Angleterre, est de chercher tous les moyens possibles pour la conversion de ces deux roiaulmes, non pour autre fin sinon seul pour le respect du service de Dieu et augmentation de nostre saincte foy, et que pour tel effect, il ne laissera de donner toute assistance et ayde, ce que j'ay de longtemps signifié a la Royne d'Escosse, et faict ma possibilité pour les affaires en bon estat; en lesquelles je n'espargneray pour estre tant du service de Dieu, jusques a la derniere goute de sang; asseurant derechef a M. le Duc, que, s'il ne seroit pour l'effect de telle negociation, jamais j'eusse demeuré tant de temps en Angleterre, encores que le Roy mon maistre me donnast le plus bel estat qu'il a en tous ses royaulmes, esperant en Dieu que fera tesmoignage la Royne d'Escosse que ce que j'ay passé et souffert pour tel respect, et aussi de l'affection avec laquelle je m'ay employé en tous les particuliers de son service, ce que feray tous les jours de ma vie, ne desirant chose plus que Dieu me donne la grace de veoir la fin de ceste entreprinse, estant soldat de Monsr le Duc, auquel je serviray avec tant de volonté, comme a d'obligation pour le faire chacun qui oye son renom.

Je serois bien aise quod Pater Personius et Criton auroient larges instructions des forteresses 44 , et 45 , pour desembarquer les gens et aultres choses qui sont bien necessaires d'entendre, a fin de preparer le secours avec la celerité qu'ilz demandent.

Ceste Royne a donné grandes querelles à l'ambassadeur de France, disant avoir entendu que M. le Duc de Guise avoit envoyé en Escosse trois navires chargés de munitions et cent chevaulx pour la garde du Roy. L'ambassadeur l'a denié. Priant le Createur vous donner, Monseigneur, longe et heureuse

vie, me recommendant a vostre bonne grace. De Londres, a 6 de Junio. Don Bernardino de Mendoça.

Outside :

Reçu, le xviij Juin, 1582 : de Londres, le 6mo du dict moys. D.B.M.

No. 27.

to Archb^{p}. Beatoun.

Scripsimus vobis ex hoc loco die 25 Junii, quæ literæ tam vobis quam Alano erant communes, exinde hæc acciderunt. Die Martis ultimo, hora nobis constituta erat, qua regem convenire debebamus, sed eo ipse die incidit in podagram manus vehementem, ex qua coactus fuit mittere sanguinem et excludere omnem audientiam, indies tamen fere aliquid nuntii ab illo accepimus per ejus 145, et nunc convalescente ea promittitur nobis statim audientia, licet tota fere materia jam illi per 145 sit communicata, et videtur bene accepta, quanquam non est expectandum aliquid concludi posse antequam resoluti fuerint ex 107, inde nihil adhuc accepimus. Necessarium est ad causam nos frequentes a vobis litteras accipere, sicut nos multum 142 sine nostris prætermittemus. Summe consulunt hic ne quicquam in 104 præcipitetur ex nimia spe ante tempus. Hac hebdomada egreditur ex hac parte classis regia instructissima. Orate pro nobis. Ulissipone, 2 Julii. Salutate omnes quos scitis salutandos ex nostra parte. Humillimus Ricardo Millino.

Addressed :

Al Montsig. Rev^{mo} Archivescovo di Glasco, Ambassadore per Seren^{ma} Regina di Scotia In Pariggi. Reçu, le xxvj Juillet, 1582, a Paris.

No. 28.

Secretary Nau to Archbp. Beatoun.

Monseigneur. En partye la rupture des intelligences de sa majesté par deça, en partye vostre absence hors de la Cour, et ma longue malladie au mesme temps, ont été cause de peu de charges et nouvelles de sa dicte majesté. Cest esté dernier depuis elle vous a escript fort amplement pour diverses negotiations, dont je desire l'issue aussi heureuse et briefve, que le maniment en est dangereux, principalement pour ceulx qui sont en cage. Je ne puis que redoubler mes doleances par les miennes plus grandes du mauvais estat ou je vois les affaires de sa majesté, estant prest de travailler, avec tout debvoir et dilligence, suivant vos ordres et advis, pour les retablir comme je proteste devant Dieu, n'y avoir obmis, jusques a present, aucune chose qui de ma part y peust servir; mais mes forces sont si faibles et tant contrariées et combatues par deça et ailleurs, que je suis contraint bien souvent ployer, pour ne demeurer sous le faix, et toutes foys asseurez vous que le cœur ny la langue ne me manqueront pour remontrer et faire librement entendre, soit soubz mon nom, on d'aultruy, tout ce que l'on me donnera charge de proposer de votre part, ou que vous mesme me commanderez, ma resolution estant de suyvre, au plus pres que je pourray, vostre intention. J'approuve infiniment l'ouverture en faveur de M. Vetus, duquel je n'ay congneu rien moins que ce que vostre Secretaire m'en a mandé, et oultre il m'a tousjours este fort affectione et bon amy, qui m'oblige davantage a faire pour luy en ceste occasion, si j'en avois le moyen. Mais sur la premiere instance que j'en ay voulu faire seulement en general, par maniere de discours, j'ay ésté renvoyé bien loing, et depuis la vielle damoiselle, a qui on en a communiqué, en est tumbé en propos fort aigres contre vous, et aultres avec moy. Vous ne croyriez comme ce Monsieur le President luy est a cœur. Le dict Sieur n'a, que je sache, rien touché de se desfaire de son estat de chancelier; ce sera s'il en a intention par Senlis,

qui depend de luy. Monseigneur, si vous me permectiez de vous dire mon simple advis de vostre voyage de Poitou, et vous supplie bien humblement m'excuser, si je presume tant, il me semble le temps ny l'estat present des affaires de sa majesté ne le requerir, et qu'au contraire il vous importe de parachever le cours que vous avez si constamment tenu, en l'adversité de sa majesté, principallement sur le point qu'elle est de finir et changer en mieux, comme il me semble y voir les affaires fort acheminées et preparées. Sa majesté a esté fort griefvement malade, et vous puis dire que, par l'espace de deux jours, nous estions en tres grande doubte de l'yssue, telle qu'elle a ésté. Je ne fauldroy de vous envoyer la descharge que vous desirez pour l'envoy de l'advance de Monsr de Chaulnes, sitost que Arnault aura renvoyé les particulieres qu'il a receues, a mesure qu'il a faict tenir ceste somme par parcelles, et diverses voyes; d'autant que oultre icelles, il demande une general, de façon que je vouldrois faire servir la vostre pour luy, affin qu'il retire sa premiere que vous en avez, et de ne faire d'une mesme chose tant d'expeditions. Vous eussiez receu le mandement des besongnes d'orfebvrie nagueres envoyé par Mons. Hotman, s'il en eust mandé le prix, mais il n'y avoit mesme aucun memoire de luy. Pour l'advenir je pense que ce serait le meilleur qu'il vous pleust envoyer a une foys les acquitz et descharges, estant fort dangereux de mectre aucune expedition hors de chiffre, parmi ces depesches secretes. Et sur ce, vous baisant tres humblement les mains, je prie Dieu qu'il vous donne longue et tres heureuse vie. A Sheffield, ce iiij Mars.

Mons. Chasteau, s'il est de retour pres Mgr de Glasgo, trouvera icy mes humbles et affectionnées recommendations à ses bonnes graces, l'asseurant que je travailleray par deça, pour la recongnoissance de ses services, et avec effect. Je le prie de faire tenir a Mons. du Russeau mon beau frere le mot cy encloz marqué Δ.

No. 29.

Secretary Nau to Archbp. Beatoun.

Je n'ay aultre subject pour le present de vous escrire, sinon puisqu'il plaise *a sa majesté* se servir de en ce voyage d' qui est, je proteste a Dieu, à mon grand regret, pour plusieurs respectz, il vous plaise luy departir vostre faveur en ce qu'il aura besoing pour faire reussir son dict voyage du contentement de *sa majesté et le bien de son service,* dont luy et moy nous demeurons obligez pour vous faire tres humble service selon notre simple pouvoir. Et en ceste devotion, je vous baise tres humblement les mains. Vostre bien humble et obeissant serviteur. Nau.

No. 30.

Instructions privées, données par la Royne d'Angleterre et le conseil privé de sa majesté a Nicolas Errington, Escuyer envoyé au Roy d'Escosse, le xxvj d'Octobre, 1581.

Sa majesté, trouvant par les advertissemens qu'elle recepvroit de jour a aultre d'Escosse, que tout le but des actions du Duc de Lenox audict Royaulme ne tendent à aultre fin que pour detruire la religion et dissouldre l'amitie avec ceste corone, elle a trouvé tres necessaire, pour eviter les dangers qui en pourroient ensuivre, si leurs desseins prenoient pied, que quelque chose doibt estre faicte pour y obvier de mesme. Et pour ce, sa majesté a conceu que vous estant envoyé au dict Royaulme, pour aultres siens affaires, pouvez, (soubz couleur de la charge à vous commise en vos instructions generalles) avec tres grande opportunité, par les plus propres, aptz, et bien affectionez instrumentz que trouverez par de là, le plus secretement que faire se pourra, adviser de quelque bonne voye, pour desappoincter l'intention et desseins dessus mentionnez, d'aultant qu'il est icy estimé (non sans solide fondement) que rien ne peult plus advancer l'intention de sa

majesté, en cest endroict, que par quelque praticque secrette ou division entre le Duc de Lenox et le Conte d'Arran, ce qui quant a soy plus d'apparence de pouvoir estre executé, et avec moins de difficulté, s'il est vray (comme est rapporté) qu'il y a desja quelques desdain faict entre eulx, et s'il est entretenu de proz et poulsé par ceulx qui secrettement pourrez employer en cella, il sera plus aysé à achever et mener à fin. Et en travaillant, debvez avoir speciallement esgard de ne rien attenter, si n'estes asseuré, ou par parolles du dict Aran, ou aultre tel asseuré moyen, que pourrez praticquer en cest endroict, qu'il y soit de soymesmes à ce incliné. Si en conférant avec luy, ou aultrement, le trouvez en opinion de rompre avec Lenox, et de se rendre a la devotion de sa majesté pour l'advancer, vous luy pourrez faire entendre que recentement ay este advertye de France d'une consultation entre l'Archevesque de Glasgo, l'Evesque de Ross, et un certain Jesuiste Escossois pour les affaires de ce Royaulme, et fust resolu entre eulx, qu'en la conclusion de telles matieres, qui touchent le fondz et secret de leurs desseins, qu'on ne se debvoit reposer ny fier a aulcun qu'ilz ne fussent recongnues pour asseurez et vrays Catholiques, et encore fut ce trouve expedient pour quelque temps, que luy et aultres de sa religion seroient employés jusques a ce que les affaires fussent menées a plus grande maturité, et aulx effects par eulx desirés. Sur quoy ilz peuvent colliger que leur intention est que luy, et aussi aultres de sa religion, ne seront employés que comme instrumentz pour y parvenir a leurs desseins. Parquoy il est à luy estre remonstré, qu'il sera aultant pour la seurté du Roy son maistre, que sauvetté de luy mésme, d'y avoir bon œil en cest affaire, et de considerer qu'il n'y a rien plus dangereux pour le dict Roy que de se allíener de sa majesté, et du respect et bon vouloir d'Angleterre. Ce qui semble estre le principal dessein du dict Lenox. Et pour ce si luy, ou aultre, a regard a la cause des bonnes procedures de sa dicte majesté de temps en temps trouvera que tout le but de l'intention de sa majesté ne tend a aultre fin qu' à la preservation de sa personne, et de maintenir son royaulme en tranquilité, ce qu'elle prétend continuer, si par luy juste occasion ne soyt donnée au contraire. Et si

de fortune Aran dissimule, en vous remonstrant l'envye qu'il a de s'opposer a Lenox, ou si apres il change son opinion, de sorte qu'il faict le dict Lenox de ses advis a luy presentement données, vous ferez bien d'user de telles parolles a Aran touchant Lenox, que sa majesté n'a aucune mescontentement particulier de Lenox pour sa personne, ou advancement en credit, mais seulement pour le respect du bien du Roy, et pour la continuation de l'accord entre les deux Royaulmes, en quoy si elle se pouvoit asseurer que les actions de Lenox se peussent joindre avec sa bonne intention, elle n'auroit aucun mescontentement du dict Lenox ny de sa grandeur. Et quant a telz discours et alheurementz, qui sans doubte sont mis en advant par le dict Lenox, tendant a la dicte alienation de sa majesté, par luy desirée, assurant le dict roy qu'il aura pour ayde et support le Pape, Espaigne et France, pour luy assister en tout ce qu'il pretendroit, ou pourroit estre persuadé d'entreprendre contre sa majesté, parceil sera expedient declairer au dict Aran, et telz aultres qui se laisseront mener par telles persuasions, en quel danger et peril le Roy leur maistre pourra tumber. Car, premierement, il est a considerer qu'ilz ne peuvent esperer aucun secours par ces Roys, sinon en renonçant la religion, surquoy telz inconvenientz ensuivront: premierement, il encourra la disgrace de Dieu, la grande bonté duquel il a jusques icy par plusieurs voyes senti, et pour ce s'il l'abandonne ne peut faillir sentir sa dure main, comme aultres princes ont faict qui l'ont delaissé. Secondement, il perdra l'amitié qu'il a avec ceste corone, d'ou, comme tout le monde congnoist, pretend recepvoir plus de commodité ou disadvantage, tout ainsi comme sés merites et desertz vers sa majesté le requeront. Finallement, il allumera une dissension en son royaume propre, par laquelle sa majesté (si de fortune il se monstre ingrat envers elle) pourra prendre tel advantage qu'il luy sera propre de bien deuement considerer advant qu'en presenter quelque juste occasion d'offenser sa dicte majesté. Maintenant si l'estat de ses supporteurs, et ce qu'il peut pretendre d'eulx est deuement considéré, premierement est aagé, et sans apparence de vivre longuement, et quiconque luy succedera, comme on voit communement, sera plus empesché à sa premiere entrée a son siege de pourvoir a sa familie et parents,

qu'aucunement prest a tenir a telles promesses, que par fortune seroient faictes par le Pape qui est a present. Et quant a l'Espagne et France, pour le premier, tout le monde voit comme il a les mains plaines du Pays Bas, et comment il est occupé de songner a conserver le Royaulme de Portugal, les subjectz naturelz du dict pays estant totallement allienez de luy, comme il est à present en danger d'avoir la guerre contre le Turc pour les affaires d'Afrique et Barbarie. Maintenant s'il se laisse mourir, comme communement aucune année ne passe, qu'il ne soit en danger de sa vie, en quelle confusion il laisseroit son royaume et tout ses dominions a son jeune filz, tout le monde le voit, estant notoire que la pluspart d'iceulx sont entierement maintenus par force. Et quant a la France, se la pauvreté de ceste couronne là, l'estat maladif du Roy, la mauvaise affection de ses successeurs envers luy, desquelz elle s'en asseure, et que de luymesme n'aura jamais lignée, la mauvaise opinion et mescontentement qu'il a de toute la maison de Guyse, d'ou le jeune Roy d'Escosse espere et pretend en avoir son plus grand support, tout ce consideré deuement, il semblera que c'est un fort foible et dangereux apuy. Mais soit que tous vivent, s'il est consideré quelz moiens sa majesté a pour les occuper en leurs mesmes Royaulmes, s'elle est pressée de se deffender, les grandes forces qu'elle a tant par terre que par mer, la faction qu'elle aura en son propre pays s'il cherche aulcune changement ou alteration en la religion, se trouvera un tres dangereux conseil sur telz vains fondemens et persuasions embaresser un fort jeune prince en si dangereux peril et encombre. Et pour ce, si le mescontentement et mespris de Dieu, la foiblesse de ses supporteurs, la division en son propre Royaulme, l'amitié et faveur d'Angleterre, et les forces de sa majeste par mer et par terre sont deuement ponderés par tous ceulx qui seront bien affectez en ce Royaulme, ne pourront si regardent deuement aux perils qui pourront en suyvre a leur Roy par iceles, que chercher par tous moiens possibles d'empescher le cours de ses violentes entreprinses, et donner conseil au Roy de chercher affectueusement la bonne affection de sa majesté envers luy, et specialement de dependre de son conseil et faveur. Il est aussi expedient que vous vous addressiez a telz que vous

trouverez bien affectionez a ceste coronne, avec l'ouverture contenue en vos instructions generales, proposée par la Royne d'Escosse pour la resignation de son tiltre a ceste corone au Roy son filz, comme chose de luy desiré, leur faisant entendre si son tiltre par aulcune telle requeste pourroit estre mis en question, et controverse, il ne peult estre que fort dangereux a ceux qui donnerent leur voix et consentement aux estatz de remouvoir la Royne d'Escosse, et d'autant plus qu'il est apparent que la dicte resignation se fera avec telles conditions desquelles sa majesté a veu un project, qui est la coppie qui vous est envoyee, et oultre la confusion que peuvent engendrer au Royaulme, ne peult qu'effectuer la rompture et divorse de la bonne amitié entre les deux coronnes. Et pour ce leur conviendra, si telle chose y est attentée, de prevoir songneusement et pourvoir a l'inconvenient qui pourra ensuivre de la. Et si de fortune la dicte resignation ne tend qu'a fortifier le tiltre du Roy, sans mettre en question la validité des dictz estatz, par lesquelles l'authorité regale luy a esté commise, lors il n'est expedient qu'aucune opposition se face. Finallement, vous fairez entendre aux biens affectéz par dela, combien soigneuse est sa majesté pour le bien et advancement de ce Royaume, et de maintenir la religion qui est la exercée, avec assurance qu'elle ne fauldra en toute opportunité qui se presentera de faire toutes choses qui sont a son pouvoir pour la preservation et continuation d'icelle. Et si de ce vous trouvez inclination en ceux qui sont de qualité pour entrer en faction par promesse a tel effect, pour oster toute scrupulle qui par fortune pourroit estre concue par aulcuns d'iceulx, que ce mesme peult estre dangereux au Roy, et prejudiciable a eulx, il est a leur estre remonstre que sa majesté ne desire promesse ny faction en ce Royaulme qu'avec les conditions qui suivent:—Que la Religion soit mainctenue—la personne du Roy preservée—la tranquilité du Royaulme continuée—Servitute estrangere evitée—les biens affectez aux gentilshommes en disgrace du Roy remis en sa faveur—reciproque justice sera usé contre les transgresseurs, tant par mer que par terre—et l'amitié éntre les deux Royaulmes continuée. Et pour aultant qu'en l'estat troublé, tout plain de factions, le Roy, estant mené par les passions de ceux de la noblesse la, desquelz il

est possedé, il pourra estre que beaucoup de poinctz contenuz aussi bien en ces presentes, comme en vos instructions generalles, seroient mieulx obliées que mise en advant, et pour ce a esté trouve expedient que soient laissez a votre discretion d'en user, comme vous trouverez convenient et agreeable aux circonstances du temps, et la presence de ceulx avec lesquels vous aurez a traicter.

Datté a Richemont, le xxvj d'Octobre, 1581.

W. BURGHLEY.
JAMES CROFTES.
CHR. HATTON.
FRA. WALSINGHAM.

APPENDIX C.

CORRESPONDENCE AS TO THE SURRENDER OF QUEEN MARY TO THE EARLS OF MAR AND MORTON.

No. 1.

I have receaved your lordshipes letters of the 29 of Septembre the 5 of this present, and shall vse all myne indevour to follow the contentes thereof, lyke as hetherto I have omytted no occasion I trust that might farther the same. Therle of Morton is wylling of hyt the Regent, as I wrote somewhat doubtfull, but he tolde me hem selfe yesterday, that assone as my Lord of Morton shall Retorne from Dakeyth, he wyll confeer with hem, and gyve me suche aunswer as shall be reasonable; yf hyt be according to therle of Mortons awne mynde, I am sure yt wyll sarve the Torne. I besich your honours in this meane tyme to beare with me, and to thinke I see the real necessytye bothe have of this thing, which I leave no meanes vnsought to bring to passe. I found the humors here strange, which, I thanke God, by the helpe of the late alteration in france, be myche changed; but for all that, on- Cal. c. iii. f. 370.

Cal. c. iii. f. 370. lesse the kings part be otherwyse looked on, I feare you can not Reape that good of them as otherwyse you might. I leave hyt to your wysdoms to considre. As for the Castylliance, I am yet fully persuaded "yet"[1] that they vse the french covrse, and hoope by that meanes to ouerthrow ther aduersarys in thend, who were euer bowing that way for want of other helpe, and therbye to avoyd the malicius intentes of ther

f. 370, b. aduersaryes, who now are forced for want of support (which the Castyllianse have from france) to agrye to a longue abstinence, in myne opynion to ther hurte, I meane the Regentes partye, as all other abstynences haue bin to them by ther awne confession; but necessytye hathe no law, they looke for no fayth in ther aduersaries but for more hurt during this abstynence then they receaved during the warres. I haue not hetherto bin moved for any thing by them but for ayde in generall termes, and I wyll them to be of good chere, saying that yf they shall shew them selfes assured fryndes to her Majestie, she wyll not se them ouerthrowen. I wyll them farther to make some ouertures, and to sett downe in wrighteing ther desires, and "they" the good may growe to bothe realmes by obteyning the same, which therle of Morton sayth he wyll cause to be done shortly after de Crocques departure, who takyth his iornay this day towards Barwick. As I have wrighten, to Mr Secretary Morton is the only man for her Majesties taccont[2] of in this Realme, and therfore to be considerd of accordingly. When any ouerture shalbe made to me of ther desires, your honour may Jug what a large fylde I shall have to amplyffye the errand I chyfly come for. I wold her Majestie wold aunswer the Regentes letter with som comfort, which letter I sent long sythens, and also to incourage therle of Morton to contynew in his good devotion.

f. 371. The Post Scrypt of your Lordships letter I aunswer thus: I trust to satisfye Morton; *and for John Knox, that thing you may se by my dispache to Mr Secretary is don and doing dayly*, the people in generall well bent to Ingland, abhorring the fact in France and fearing ther Tirany. John Knox is now so feble as scarce can he stand a lone or speak to be hard of any audience, yet dothe he euery sonday cause hem

[1] Erased in MS. [2] To account.

selfe to be karied to a place where a certayn nombre doe here hem and precheth with the same vehemencye and zeale that euer he did. He dothe Reuerence your Lordship myche, and wylled me once agayn to send you worde that he thanked god he had obtayned at his handes that the Gosple of Jesus Chryst is trwly and simply preached thorow Scotland, which dotthe so comfort hem, as he now desiryth to be out of this myserable lyffe. He sayd further, that it was not long of your Lordship that he was not a great buschope in Ingland; but this effect growen in Scotland, he being an instrument, doth myche more satisfye hem. He desired me to make his last comendations most humbly to your Lordship, and withall that he prayed god to incresse his strong spiret in you, saying ther was neuer more nead, and quod he to me take heade how you belyue them of the Castle, for sure they wyll deceave you; and trust me, I know they seake nothing more then the Rwyne of your masteres, which they have bin about of long tyme. For lydingtons cuming into Ingland I think you be satisfyed in som of my former letters that he meanyth nothing lesse, and therefore I pray you to considre the Course he takyth, which is cleane Contrary to ours in this treatye by consent of therle of Morton and the Regent. I haue done all offices to content the Castyllance, all beinge granted that they cold Require, in hoope they wold haue stode to their promes, and hand wright gyven heretofore that they would lett her Maiestie be Jug of ther controversye; but when yt cumyth to the pynch, they "scrynk" fynd evasions; whereas, as yf they wold haue bydden by ther worde, I had obtayned of the lord a sufficyent grant to make an indifferent peace, to the satisfacion of all parties, and specially them of the castle, without offence of thother syde. Your honours most bounden,

H. KYLLEGREW.

Cal. c. iii. f. 371.

f. 371, b.

No. 2.

The aduertismentes I wrote in my last of the 6000 frankes which the Castyll had Receaved out of France is confirmed agayn vnto me by Mr Marshall spiall, and farther that the

f. 372.

Cal. c. iii. f. 372. Captayn thereof hathe made assured promes to kepe the castell to the french kinges devotion. He lookyth also for his brother with more mony, and for ayd out of France to wreyke his aduersaries before the next abstynence be expired, which shall contynew tell the sixt of decembre, as we "hath" haue hetherto agryed. Le Croc goyth to hasten thayd, and to lett the King vnderstand what a partye he may haue here. "Yt" he semed to be carelesse of thabstynence as yt apperyth, for in dead he hathe don nothinge to procure hyt, but Rather to haue leyft them as well in war as in devysion. He makyth account of the duc and therles of hontley and athol with the Castyllians. The captain, as I am informed, hathe a pension of the french king of 1000 frankes by yere, new brought hem. Other pensions he hathe offered, but I know not who hathe Receaved any more.

Thus haueing aunswered so myche of your honours letters as I can for this tyme, I humbly Reffer you for the Reast of my negotiation here sythence my last to Mr secretary letters. [I] besich almightye god to preserve your honors.

At Edembourg this 6 of Octobre 1572. By your good lordshippes most bounden,

H. KYLLEGREW.

f. 372, b. *Address:*—To the right honorable my Singuler good Lordes my Lord Tresorer of Ingland, [a]nd to the right honorable [Er]le of Lester.

Endorsement:—6 Octobre 1572. Mr Killigrew to my lord, from Edenbrough.

No. 3.

f. 373. My singuler good lordes, what hathe passed here sythence my last touching the comon cause I haue wrighten to Mr Secretary at length. Now for the great matter you wott of at my being at Dakeyth with my lord Regentes grace, Therle of Morton, and he had conference, *and bothe wylling to doe the thing you most desire,* howbeyt I cold haue no aunswer ther, but that *bothe thought yt thonly way and the best way to end all*

troblcs as yt were in bothe Realmes. They told me, notwith- Cal. c. iii.
standing, the matter was dangerus, and might com so to passe f. 373.
as they shold draw a warr vppon ther headdes, and in that
case, or Rather to stoppe that peryll, they wold desire her
maiestie shold enter in league defensyve, comprehending
therin the cause of Religion also. We came to nearer termes,
to wytt, that her maiestie shold for a certayn tyme pay the
som that her highnes bestowyth for the keping of her in Ing-
land to the preservation of this Crowne, and take the pro-
tection of the yong king. All this I hard, and sayd if they
thought yt not proffytable for them, and that yf they ment
not to wyll me to wright ernestly as ther desire, I wold not
moue my pen for the matter, whereat *Therle of Morton* f. 373, b.
*Raysed hem selfe in bed and sayd that bothe my Lord Regent
and he did desire hyt as a sufferayn salue for all ther sores,*
howbeyt yt cold not be don withoute som maner of sery-
monye and a kynd of proces, whereonto the noblemen must
be called after a secret maner, and the Clergy lykwyse, which
would aske som tyme. Also that yt wold be Requyset her
Maiestie shold send suche a convoy with the partye, that in
case ther awne people wold not lyke of hyt, they might be
able to kepe the field, adding forther that yf they can bring
the nobylytye to consent, as they hoope they shall, they wse
not kepe the prysoner 3 howres a lyffe after he[1] com into the
boundes of Scotland; but I, leaueing of these devises, desired
to know indead what they wold haue me wright, and yt was
aunswered that I shold know forther of my Lord Regentes
grace here; so as this morning, a lytle before dyner, going to
take my leaue of hem, "he," as he was going towardes ster-
ling, he tolde me, touching that matter which was comoned
vppon at Dakyth, he founde yt very good and the best Rem-
edye for all diseases, and wylled me so to wright vnto your
honours, neuerthelesse that yt was of great wayght, and
Therfor he wold aduise hem of the forme and maner how yt
might best be brought to passe, and that knowen, he wold
conferr more at lengyth with me in the same. Thus toke I f. 374.
my leaue of hem, and fynd hem indead more cold then Mor-
ton, and yet he semed glad and desirous to have hyt com to

[1] *Sic* in original.

Cal. c. iii. f. 374. passe. The parlament, som thinke, must be called vppon a sodayn, and as yt were for som other cause, or they can prosyd by ordre of Justyce, for altho she be condemned as worthye of her demyssion, and art and part as they termed of the morther of her husband, yet was she not Jugged to dye for the same. Weather this be an excuse to delay tyme, I leave your honours to Jug; but sure I am, the most part of the nobylytye, all the borows *and mynesters, wolde be Ryght glad of hyt.* This is all I can get out of these men hetherto, and "therefore I" doe refferr the valew thereof to your honours Jugment, besiching your aunswer with speed by this bearer, that yf this wyll not sarve your torne I may be Revoked, as your honour may doe the same conveniently with her maiesties sarvice. I made a motion at Dakyth to haue the kinges part to comytt ther dyfferent to the Quenes Maiesties, because yt might be a Covre.[1] My abode here after Monsieur de Crocques departure, what aunswer I had is wrighten in my letters to Mr Secretary, with som other Requestes my Lord
f. 374, b. Regent and Therle of Morton made to me to wright vnto her most excellent Maiestie, bothe touchinge the borders and the keping or dyscharging of ther soldiers here, besyching your Lordshipps to hasten this bearer with thaunswer vnto them. And your farther wylles how I shall *deale in this great matter, which hathe bin moved by them, and not by my selfe, as a thing put in ther headdes by a trustye and wyse instrument, who hathe had the dealing in hyt heretofore, Mr N. Elueston by name,* who provoked them to move hyt vnto me. I sent vp this moring (*sic*) to my Lord of Lydington to know weather he wold make aunswer to your lordships letters, and he sent me these inclosed. Myne opynion of hem and his faction is all Readye by others of myne knowen vnto your honours, and therfore I wyll troble you no farther at this tyme, besyching Almightye God to haue you allways in his blessed keping. From Edenbourg this 9 of Octobre 1572. Your honours most bounden during lyfe,

H. KYLLYGREWE.

What I shall here more of this matter, as I am made be-

[1] Cover.

lyue I am lyke to doe shortly, I wyll aduertys your honours with all speade. Cal. c. iii. f. 374, b.

Addressed:—To the Right Honorable my singuler good lord [the] l. of Bourghley, high [Tr]esorer of Inglande. f. 372, c.

Indorsed:—9 Octobre 1573. Mr Killigrew to my l.

No. 4.

Altho ther be that doe assure me that the Regent hathe after a sorte moved this matter to ix of the best of ther partye, to wytt, that yt were fytt to make a humble Request to the Quenes Maiestie to haue hether the cause of all ther trobles, and to doe dye who haue consented to hem, and that I am also borne in hand that bothe he and Therle of Morton doe by all Dexterytye prosyde in the fortherance thereof; yet can not I assure my selfe of any thing, because I see them so inconstant, so devided, and so "sho" slow in seaking ther awne weale; and therfore doe besich your Lordship that yf any other way is to be had lett this be the last. I am also told that the hostages haue bin talked of, and that they shal be delyuered to our men apon the fyldes, and the matter dyspached within 4 houres, so as they shall not nead to tarry long in our handes; but I lyke not ther maner of dealing, and therfore leaue hyt to your wysdom to consydre yf you wyll haue me contynw to gyve eare, and aduertys I shall; yf not, I pray your lordship lett me be called hence. They wold gladly ioyne them selfes in a league defensyve for Religion with her Maiestie, but that can not be contracted but by bandes after the Scotisch maner, for ther king is vnder age and the Contry devyded. f. 375.

They of the Castle be veary Jocond, and gyve forth tales as tho ther Queen shold be home shortly. What yt meanyth I know not, but yt apperyth ther shold be som thretteinge message sent from beyond the seas vnto her maiestie to that end.

Thus leauing to troble your honour any farther, I end,

Cal. c. iii. f. 375. besiching almightye god to preserve bothe you and yours. At Edenbourgh this 9 of Octobre, by your honours most bounden,

H. KYLLYGREW.

No. 5.

f. 376. Sythence my letters vnto your honours of the ix of this present, I have bin at Dakyth, and conferred with my Lord of Morton apon too poyntes, thone of the great matter, and how caldly my Lord Regentes grace had aunswered me therin; thother to presse hem to fram an aunswer to the forme of assurance exhebyted by the Castylliance: and after long debating, we fell to this conclusion, that bothe was necessary to be considered of out of hand, and therfor he desired me that the abbott of Domferling and the clerke of the Registre might com vnto hem the next morning, which was the 12, by whom he wold send vnto the Regentes grace his full mynde, and a swre way how to prosyde in the great matter, which, yf the Regent wold not accept and follow with all possible dillygence, he wold hem selfe and his fryndes vndertake the matter. And that this matter may be colored, he sendyth thether with them the Justice Clerk, for framing such an aunswer to the demand of the Castylliance as may stand with the kinges swrtye and ther honour to grant vnto, which being sean by her Maiestie and her counsell, he trustyth wylbe founde Reasonable.

f. 376, b. These men are to be at Sterling the 15 of this present, and I ther in lyke wyse, to presse the Regent to the spedye fortherance of a peace, and from thence I shalbe able to wrighte more certaynly in bothe these matters then hetherto I cold. I perceave more and more dayly the weaknes of these men in dispacheing wayghtye affayres, and I fynd Therle of Morton and these too mynesters veary hott and ernestly bent in the matter. Morton is leutenant generall on this syde tay, and by that authorytye, with som seremony of a Running parlament, which is in force presently, he myndyth to take this matter in hande yf the Regentes grace shalbe slow and colde

in the "matter" same. These parties are also to deale with the Contesse of Mar for her fortherance, which they hoope to bring to passe, because they haue concluded the mariage betwix therle of Anguysch and the Regentes daughter, wherevnto I did not a lytle helpe to make a sounde fryndshipe betwyne them. Therle of Morton assured me that the chyffest cause he condessendid vnto hyt at this tyme was for the fortherance of the great matter, and told me withall that yf the Regent did not Imbrasse yt ernestly yt shold make hem thinke twyse of the matter. Cal. c. iii. f. 376, b.

Therle and I had long talke of matters past, and of some tales which had bin told agaynst hem, wherebye her maiestie was made his heavye ladye, to which matters I did satysfye hem, and that yt was the treatye and league with France which made her maiestie and her Counsell withdraw ther dealing in Scotland, but now the deceit thereof apperyth, he shall fynde her maiestie and my Lords of her Counsell to be the same towardes the king and his state, and to his Lordship in particuler, "as" that they have shewen them selfes to be heretofore. He sayd that the coldnes vsed had almost alyenated a great many, and won them in a maner to be french, altho, for his awne part, "yt" he did see that the depending vppon her maiestie was most expedient, bothe for ther king and estates in particuler, and sayth he, yf her maiestie shall now be contented to ayd vs with som what to pay our soldiers, whereby we be not discredyted, but that we may haue them with vs to this Rode appon the thendes of the borders, yt wyll wyn her maiestie all the kinges partyes hartes more assured then euer they were. I aunswered that the tyme was dangerous, and her maiestie had to doe with men and mony for the deffence and garde of her awne, notwithstanding yf I cold haue bin able with that Request to haue gyven som good assurance to performe the great matter, I wold not doubt but your good Lord wold haue so delt with her maiestie as ther desires shold haue bin satisfied, and sayd farther yt was the swrytye and knitting of bothe Realmes in a league defensyve, and without that aman cold promes nothing. These and many suche lyke "freakes," freaches passed, as also how necessary yt is now for them to thinke apon a peace, and to f. 377. f. 377, b.

Cal. c. iii. f. 377, b. procure hyt by all the meanes they can possible. My reasons and considerations did so move hem, as he desired me, as I wrote before, to cause the too persons above mentioned to com vnto hem. I the next day went to the Castle and delt lykwyse with them, whom I founde more Reasonable then before I had don, and told them I had bin at dakyth to presse for an aunswer to ther demandes, and not to be Idele nor to suffer this abstynence to be spent, as the last was, without doing any good, for the Quene my mistresses intent was that I shold vse all good meanes to bring them to a perfayct accord, and therfore desired them "selfes" to inclyne ther selfes that way, which I shold belyve they wold doe when I shold se them wylling to Reffer ther Controversies to her Maiestie, because among them selfes I was sure they cold not be taken vp, and the french king was far of, and his Imbassadour not lyke to be here in tyme to be a meane betwyne them, wherby they might
f. 378. easely se he Rather he Rather (*sic*) intended devision then vnion. They confessed no lesse vnto me, and sayd they looked shortly to here from the duc and erle of hontlye, and that for suche an aunswer as shold content me. They wold fayne haue me grant vnto them that yf they did put the matter into the Quenes handes, I shold promes them the kepying of the Castle, and a statute for the swrtye in that forme which they had drawen, and farther som Relyffe to the payment of ther deabtes, also my lord Hume to be restored to his howse and landes. I sayd I wold promyse them nothing, but they might assure them selfes that the Quene my souverayn wold not make any accord but with equall and good conditions, according to the degryes of the partes, and the kinges swrtye and honour once provydd, for that she wold haue Respect to the necessitye of a good peace at this tyme, which cold not be yf she shold gyve any sentence that might alynanat ether partye from the same, or to myslyke the conditions therof. Yf I may gett both partes once to Reffer ther controversies to her maiesties decision, I wyll hoope a good peace wyll follow, and that shortly, for I fynd therle of morton well inclyned, and the Castyllians of late, what so euer they haue hard more conformable.

f. 378, b. Trw yt is that I have held them short, and caused som

speaches to fall that hathe com to ther eares, as though her maiestie taking ordre for defense ouer all her Realme, and hering of Strozzi cuming hether, had determyned to send v^m. men to these fronters. What this hathe wrought I know not, but Lydington is styll inquisytiue of me what Comyssion I have to aunswer my lord Hume yf a peace shold follow. I besich your lordship therfore to send me instructions in these poyntes, and suche other as you thinke necessary, for I have none in particuler, and therfor can aunswer no particuler demand they make but in generall termes. As to this poynt of my Lord Hume, I have sayd that yf a good peace be concluded, I think her maiestie wyll not kepe any foot of land of his, etc. Yf a peace grow, and the great matter take place, it must neades be that Lydington com into England, bothe tadovyd practis here agaynst the Regyment, as also by his being in Ingland to kepe all his faction and partye at her maiesties devotion, and that is the consideration. Withall, I think yt wylbe the Rather condessended that Grange shall kepe the Castle yf Lydington be out of the Realme. Cal. c. iii. f. 378, b.

After I shall haue bin at Sterling, and seane these matters better framed, I shall send Captayn Ethrington with them. In this meane tyme I humbly besich your honour to kepe them in hoope of Relyffe of ther soldiers, otherwyse I feare I shalbe to doe small service here; but in that and all other matters I Reffer me to the consideration of your wysdoms, and shall pray to god from the bottom of my hart to assist you with his holly and mightye sprytt in this dangerous dayes. Sure my Lord, with good dealing from you, I thinke this nation wold be brought to sarve her maiestie to great porpose, as the world is marry. Yt most be som what elles then bare wordes that must bynde them. f. 379.

At Edenbourg this 13 of Octobre. By your honours most bounden, H. KYLLYGREW.

Addressed:—To the Right Honorable my lord Tresorer of Ingland, [and to] the Right Honorable [Th]erle of Leycester, yeue these. f. 379, b.

Endorsed:—13 Octobre 1572. Mr Killigrew to my L. T. & Erle of Leicester.

APPENDIX D.

Although the confession of the Earl of Bothwell has disappeared, the following contemporary paper in French is preserved in the royal library at the Castle of Drottningholm in Sweden.—See the Bannatyne Club Papers for 1829, "Les affaires du Comte de Boduel." In this narrative, of which we can hardly doubt that Bothwell supplied the materials, he naturally seeks to conceal his own share of guilt, and to throw the entire blame of Darnley's death upon Murray, Morton, and their associates. The translation of this paper is reprinted from the Appendix to the third edition of the 'Life of Mary Queen of Scots,' by Henry Glassford Bell, late Sheriff of Lanarkshire, whose recent death has been so widely and so justly deplored.

MEMOIR OF EARL BOTHWELL'S AFFAIRS IN THE YEAR 1568.

To the end that the King of Denmark, and the Council of this kingdom, may better and more clearly understand the wickedness and treachery of my accusers, hereafter mentioned, I have, as briefly as possible, related, and truly declared, the causes of the disturbances and commotions which have happened, of which they themselves alone are the principal authors and originators, since the year 1559 until the present time. I have likewise narrated their calumnies, not forgetting the great dishonour and injury they have done to me.

All which things I can and will maintain to be true, as, by the help of God, every one may clearly see and understand. Copenhagen, on the Eve of Epiphany, 1568.

Here followeth a list of the names of the principal chiefs and authors of all these disturbances and seditions:—

The Earl of Murray,	The Lord Lindsay,
Athol,	The Secretary Lethington,
Glencairn,	The Clerk Register,
Morton,	The Clerk of Justice.
Marr,	

Item of those who have united with the above-named noblemen in these last disturbances:—

The Lords	Hume,	Tullibardin,
	Sanquhar,	The Provost of Edinburgh,
	Sempel,	Sir James Balfour.
	Ruthven,	

The above-named Lords, being weary of the obedience and fidelity which they owed their superior, commenced agitations and the forming of secret assemblies throughout the kingdom, wishing to seduce the multitude to favour their enterprises; and, in order to persuade them the more readily of the goodness and justice of the cause, they made a pretext of religion, the preservation of which they pretended to be their aim. Thus, the conspiracy which they had formed against their queen—many other points and articles of their guilt I omit—began by the siege of the town of Leith; and their efforts against her majesty, and the Lords of her Council, as well as against her other faithful subjects of the said town, were unremitted. They likewise persecuted those who resided in their houses in the country, when they refused to join them, doing to them all the injury they could, plundering their houses and castles, and, throughout the country, effecting much mischief to several persons of wealth, notwithstanding that the queen, together with the secular nobility and some others of her subjects, previously had resolved to reform the religion, and establish it on such a footing, that they should be in no manner aggrieved thereby. They, however, not being satisfied with this, persevered in their evil machinations; and, in order to re-excite new disorders, they gave free entry to the English, our ancient enemies, allying themselves, and treating with them secretly against the queen and the subjects of her kingdom. They besieged again the town of Leith, (having formerly been compelled to raise the siege of that place,) in order to drive away, by their forces, the French who guarded the said city against the attacks of our ancient enemies aforesaid.

First sedition.

Second sedition.

His most Christian Majesty had some time before espoused the young Queen of Scotland, which caused the secular no-

bility, and other subjects of the said kingdom, to enter into certain engagements with him, and even by letters which they sent by their ambassadors to France, to offer him their faithful service, according to the devoir of good subjects. I am, however, ignorant of the reason which prompted them to do this.

In the mean time, by means of the succours which they received from England, the aforesaid town (Leith) was surrendered by a treaty made between her said majesty and the Queen of England, which was arranged by their ambassadors, and by which it was stipulated, that all hatred and rancour on both sides should be extinguished. Their hearts, however, were so envenomed, that they never ceased seeking out those who had formerly offended and annoyed them during the said siege; me, in particular, who, unworthy of such a favour, had, by the queen my mistress, been chosen lieutenant-general, to provide for the emergencies of the war; during which, I, according to the laws of arms, made several prisoners, both Scotch and English, always acting to the best of my ability, and conducting myself as my duty required. I also took, on the frontiers, a certain sum of money coming from England, destined for the pay and maintenance of their soldiers.

The cause and commencement of their hatred towards me.

A short time after the surrender of the town of Leith, and the return of the French to their country, his most Christian Majesty died. Then the queen, by the advice of her friends, and conformably with the request of her faithful subjects, resolved to return to her kingdom. This she did, in order that she might, with more convenience, maintain and strengthen the alliance and treaty aforesaid, and also in order to recompense the faithful services of her said subjects during her absence. Me she rewarded much more liberally and honourably than I had merited. This displeased my enemies to such a degree, that, by their slanderous fictions and malice, they caused the queen to change her singular favour and goodwill towards me. They likewise caused the Earls of Arran and Huntly to be driven into exile: this they did because the Earl of Arran was nearly related to the queen, and might succeed to the crown. The Earl of Huntly and myself they exiled, because they suspected that we might hinder their design.

The queen returns to Scotland from France.

The principal in this sedition was the Earl of Murray, a bastard son of her said majesty's father, formerly a canon and prior of St Andrews, who thought that our ruin would be greatly to his advantage, and hoped, when we were defeated, that he would easily accomplish his purpose, which was to become the second person in the kingdom; and, after that, he would so manœuvre that the queen, the secular nobility, and all the other subjects, and in general all the states of Scotland, should unanimously consent to his being declared heir to the crown, the title reverting to his progeny, or his near relations, in case the queen should die without issue.

Murray's subtle measures and contrivances in order to succeed to the crown.

In order to have a pretext for his arrogance, he circulated the false report, that the Earl of Arran and myself (having a short time before been reconciled, after a difference which existed between us,) had resolved to put him to death, and also some of the Lords of the Council; likewise that I intended to take the queen by surprise, and carry her off to some one of my country houses, which ever I should think most secure.

In consequence of these false accusations, it was ordered that we should be confined in close prison in Edinburgh Castle, although we had previously demanded to be heard in this cause, and proceeded against as was usual in all such cases: but this was not permitted.

Our imprisonment.

The Earl of Huntly having been charged with the same crime, and not entertaining any suspicion, was taken unawares, on a journey in the country, and secretly put to death, by the said Earl of Murray. The son of the said Earl of Huntly was also taken, indicted, and condemned, and all his houses and property confiscated to the crown.

The Earl of Huntly taken and put to death.

When I heard of this horrible murder, and of this unjust persecution, I considered by what means I might ascertain what will the queen bore toward me, and at length I was told that she well knew that I was accused from hatred and envy: she could, however, in no manner aid or assist me, as she herself had no authority at all; but she recommended me to do my best for my deliverance.

This answer made me exert myself to get out of prison; and when I was at large, I determined to go to France by sea, but storm and tempest drove me toward England, where

the Queen of England showed me great friendship; and some of her faithful servants treated me with great kindness; indeed much more than I had ever expected, particularly as, during the war, I had done irreparable injuries on the frontiers, and even to the inhabitants of that country. I then, pursuant to my plan of going to France, left England, having received certain letters from the Queen of Scotland, sent to me by her before I left England, for his most Christian Majesty, and the Lords of his Council, desiring that I might enjoy those *privileges*[1] with which the nobility of my country are honoured there, in conformity with ancient treaties arranged between the two kingdoms aforesaid, France and Scotland. Being thus provided with these letters, and having proceeded to France, I received others from the Queen of Scotland, by which she ordered me to return to Scotland for the reasons following:—

I was made Captain of the Scottish Guard.

The queen having understood their cunning and evil designs, and wishing to establish good order and police in her kingdom, for the benefit and comfort of her subjects, resolved to marry a young prince of her own blood royal, who, accordingly, had arrived from England. She expected, (and with reason,) that no person could or would pretend to lay any impediment in the way of the match: this, however, the agitators aforementioned did to the utmost of their power, wishing, above all things, that the queen should have no children, for the reasons already stated; and, moreover, they could not endure that anybody should have any authority in the kingdom but themselves; and they foresaw that they would be deprived of authority by the said marriage.

The Queen of Scotland marries a young prince of the name of Henry Stuart.

For this reason, having deliberated about the matter, they determined to put the said prince to death; and they assembled their friends and accomplices for this purpose. Likewise, a short time after the nuptials of the said queen and of the said prince, the said conspirators determined to seize the queen—to carry her away captive, and detain her as a prisoner, as they also most wickedly did afterwards, contrary to pledged faith and promises, and the conditions to which

The third sedition, and the plans of my enemies.

[1] *Estatz* is the French word.

they altogether had agreed, as will be seen from that which follows.

I being now returned from France, the queen intrusted me with the command of a number of soldiers, her faithful subjects and my particular friends, by whose assistance I endeavoured to chase the said Earl of Murray out of the kingdom of Scotland into England; and this I effected. In the mean time all the states of the kingdom were assembled, in order to take cognisance of and judge of such property as might be confiscable to the crown.

The conspirators driven out of the country.

There were some of the accomplices of the said Earl of Murray following the court of the queen, who, in order to prevent the execution of the sentence pronounced against him, excited new disorders, by means of the murder perpetrated on a person called Signor David, the Italian, which was committed in the queen's saloon, in the palace of Edinburgh, while she was at supper, where none of her guards were present, nor even any of those who usually waited on the queen. If some noblemen and myself had not avoided the danger, by escaping through a back window of the palace, we should have received the same treatment, for such was the determination they had come to; or at least we should have been compelled to give our approval to so wicked and horrible a transaction.

Fourth sedition, caused by the death of Signor David.

This murder having been perpetrated by the counsel and instigation of the said Earl of Murray, the said earl returned from England, hoping to get the government into his own hands, and to detain the queen as a prisoner, whom they already before sufficiently confined in her own residence of Holyroodhouse.

The Earl of Morton, Lord Lindsay, Lord Ruthven, and others.

In order to give some pretext to this murder, they said that they had received an express command from the king, and, for greater surety, even letters under his seal.

Their false pretexts, in order to give a colour to the said murder.

Having left the said queen's palace, and finding ourselves in security, we gathered our most intimate friends, her majesty's faithful subjects, together, in order to deliver her, and the king her husband, from the captivity in which they were kept; and this we effected, partly by stratagem and partly by force. The day following, their majesties went together towards Edinburgh, with a good number of people, and pursued

4000 men. The Earl of Murray driven away a second time.

the said Earl of Murray and his accomplices so vigorously, that they were compelled to leave the country. The queen also, highly indignant at such an assassination, held them in the greatest abhorrence; as did the nobility, and the other subjects of the kingdom; and the king hated them even more. For as soon as he arrived in the said city, he ordered it to be notified by public proclamation, that what the murderers (who had killed Signor David) had propagated concerning his majesty was by them falsely invented: and he expressly ordered to all the state officers of the said kingdom, to make a diligent search, and imprison those who had assisted the said murderers in the said deed, whosoever they might be, and bring them to capital punishment. And if there were any who secretly aided them, he desired that they should be subjected to bodily punishment; likewise, that those who faithfully executed the said order should be liberally rewarded; and, in order to show an example to others, he had, in the mean time, four of those who were present at the said murder apprehended, of whom two were executed on the spot.

The Declaration of the King of Scotland respecting the letters and permission which the said murderers stated themselves to have received from his majesty.

Some friends of those who were in exile, observing the severe punishment to which the king subjected them, did not fail to advertise the others of it, who, for this reason, conceived such a hatred against the king, that they industriously sought every opportunity of revenging themselves on his majesty; for he had publicly denied the order which they said he had given to them, and the letters with which they stated he had furnished them; and they were well assured that, during his life, they could in no manner remain with safety in Scotland; but that they would always be in an uncertainty of their lives, their property, and honours. Many others were also of the same opinion. Some time after, to the end that they might the more readily accomplish their wicked design, they promised to forget all that was passed, and by good offices of true friends, to satisfy those whom they had formerly offended and bore hatred to; and by such persuasions and sweet words, they solicited those who could aid them in regaining the queen's good graces, and, among other noblemen, they also applied to me for the same purpose: wherein I did all I could, in such a manner that they obtained their request, for

The hatred which they conceived against the king, on account of his declaration.

The cunning by which they executed their design.

they had great confidence in me, on account of the favour with which her majesty honoured me, and the influence which I had with her, which I had acquired solely by the faithful discharge of my duty in the wars of the late queen her mother, and also in the troubles of her own reign, in which I repeatedly hazarded my own life, and incurred great expense, for which she has generously rewarded me, as well by presents as by offices of high rank. Having obtained their pardon, and permission for them to follow the court, I intended to live in peaceful retirement, after the imprisonment and anxiety of mind I had suffered, and think no more of revenge or quarrel. But those to whom this grace had been shown, following the court, became so obedient, and exhibited such benign manners to every one, that all the nobility and gentry of the kingdom greatly rejoiced thereat, and particularly at the extinction of all quarrels in the said court. Notwithstanding this, they persevered in their evil designs without intermission, day and night, seeking out means of putting the king to death.

My determination.

Their dissimulation.

Some time after, the king fell sick of the smallpox,[1] and a lodging was prepared for him in a place called Kirk-of-Field, (to prevent his injuring the queen's and the infant's health,) until such time as he should recover. This was done by the consent of the queen and the Lords of her Council, who wished to preserve the health of all parties.

Then the traitors, finding the opportunity so favourable, brought a quantity of gunpowder, and took it into the house where the king was, and put it under his bed, afterwards setting it on fire, so that the king was blown up and killed. This was done at the house of Sir James Balfour, on whom the queen had at that time bestowed a benefit, and to whom she had given the government of Edinburgh Castle, with all

Fifth sedition.

The king's death.

[1] The words of the original are "*petite roniole;*" and it is remarkable that "*petite verole*" (smallpox) had been written before, and the word "*verole*" expunged, apparently by Bothwell himself, *roniole* being written instead of it above the line. Thus it appears plain that he wished to express a disease different from the smallpox. *Roniole*, more modernly spelt *rognole*, means *itch*. What sort of itch Bothwell may have alluded to, it is impossible to say. The word "*petite*," belonging to *verole*, and not to *roniole*, may have been left unexpunged by inadventure.

her treasures, jewels, vessels of silver, wardrobe, and furniture this being the strongest place in the realm.

Evidence respecting the place where I was when the king was betrayed.

The same night on which this deed was committed, some noblemen of the Council happened to be with the queen, at the Palace of Holyrood, as usual. I was also lodged within the precincts where the guard usually is quartered, which consisted of fifty men. And being in my bed with my first princess, the sister of Earl Huntly, her brothers came in the morning to inform me of the king's death, at which I was highly distressed, as also many other noblemen with me.

The said Earl of Huntly was of opinion that a Council should be held immediately, to deliberate about the means of apprehending the traitors who had committed the said deed.

Careful search made by the Earl of Huntly and myself, by order from the queen and the Lords of her Council.

Then we were ordered by the queen, who was greatly distressed and afflicted, with the Lords of the Council aforesaid, to gather together some soldiers, in order to make a diligent search for the said traitors, and apprehend them. This we did, and, coming to the house where the king lay a corpse, we first put his body under a guard of honour, and then we found a barrel, or cask, in which the powder had been, which we preserved, having taken note of the mark upon it.

In our fury we apprehended some persons suspected of the deed, and put them under arrest, until they should render to us a sure account of the place they had been when the murder was committed. Nor did I ever cease making strict search, that I might get at the bottom of the whole; for I could not imagine that I could ever be suspected. Some Lords of the Council, fearing lest the queen and myself should make inquiries respecting them, united themselves, and manœuvred against the queen and the rest of us, in order to prevent our arriving at any certainty. They did not fail also to make use of all their cunning and falsehood, fixing advertisements and placards during the night on the town-house and doors of churches, and about public places and thoroughfares, in order to throw on me the suspicion that I had committed the said deed.

Their contrivances to throw suspicion on others.

My earnest entreaty to be tried.

By these means, finding myself blamed and accused of a crime of which I and all mine were innocent, (God be my witness!) I entreated the queen and the Lords of her Council

to permit that I might stand my trial in a court of justice; and, when a strict inquisition had been made, if I were found guilty, that I should be punished according to the nature of such a crime; in the same manner, if I were found innocent (as I actually was), then that a stop should be put to the rumour and the scandal circulated. This was agreed to, and a day fixed on which I was to appear in court.

My first appearance in court, and my defence.

The Lords of the Council assembled at the place appointed for my trial, and along with them a great number of the nobility and commoners. Among the Lords of the Council, and the said nobility, who were to judge in my cause, there were even those who had taken a part against me: the Earl of Morton, the Lord Ruthven, the Lord Lindsay, the Lord Sempel, the Secretary, the Clerk of Justice, and the Clerk Register; and, after the points of impeachment against me had been read, and my adversaries (particularly the prosecutor, the Earl of Lennox, who, having been summoned, did not, however, appear) had found that they had no just cause against me in any manner whatever, neither against my person, my property, nor my honour, I was, according to the custom of the country, by the sentence of the judges, and the consent of the prosecutors then present, declared innocent, free, and discharged of every point in my indictment, which was for being art and part in the plan and execution of the murder committed on the person of King Henry, my lord and master—a charge which could in no manner be proved; but, on the contrary, I established an *alibi* by competent witnesses.

My sentence.

Protestation of my adversaries.

My enemies and prosecutors having found that I was free and discharged, and that I had gained my cause, rose and ardently entreated me not to call them to account for the unjust complaints they had made against me; but their proposals were as far from their heart as they were near their lips, as I have afterwards experienced, and feel at this present.

My letters of defiance publicly exhibited in my just cause.

A second time, according to the custom of the said country, and in conformity with the laws of arms, I caused a proclamation to be made in Edinburgh, and letters, under my seal, to be affixed on the church-doors, on the town-house, and other public places, in the following form: "In defence of my honour and reputation, if there be any noble or commoner,

rich or poor, who presumes to accuse me of treason, open or secret, let him present himself, that I may give him battle in this just cause." To which no man ever responded.

My sentence confirmed by Parliament.

The third time I asserted my innocence in the presence of a general assembly of the Three Estates, the secular nobility, all the bishops, abbots, and friars, and all the principal inhabitants of the kingdom, where my entire process and sentence were read and reviewed, all points being well considered, whether my cause were legally judged or not, and whether there were not some points or articles fraudulently introduced.

It was by them declared, that the procedure had been according to right and justice, and the laws of the country; and consequently I remained free and discharged of all accusations. Moreover, it was proclaimed and published, that, on pain of death, none should be so presumptuous, after the said day, to accuse or calumniate me or mine for this said cause.

The articles published.

Having gained my cause as aforesaid, there came to my place of residence twenty-eight of the said Parliament, of their own free accord, without being asked; being twelve earls, eight bishops, and eight lords, doing me the honour of offering me their alliance and friendship, in the manner following:—

The polite offers, alliances, and promises which were made to me by the Lords of Parliament.

In the first place, they expressed themselves satisfied of my having done my duty in clearing my honour of all things laid to my charge, and that they accordingly would devote their own persons, property, relations, and friends, and everything thereon depending, to defend me against, and in opposition to, all those who should, in time to come, call me to account, in any manner whatever, for the said crime. Moreover, they returned me thanks, every one in particular, that I had comported myself so amicably towards them. And they farther thus addressed me: That they observed that the queen was a widow, and might have more children, having, as yet, had only a young prince; that they would not permit her to marry a stranger, and that I appeared to them the most worthy of those that were in the kingdom; that they were, therefore, resolved to do all in their power to the end that

this marriage might be accomplished; and that they would oppose all those who should in any way hinder it.

My wife repudiated.

At the same time, they deliberated in what manner I could lawfully repudiate my first princess, according to the divine laws of the Church and the customs of the country; on which they instantly agreed.

The marriage between the Queen of Scotland and me.

In the like manner they presently had a conference with the queen about the means by which her marriage with me might be solemnly accomplished, in their own presence, and that of the Church assembled.

The Lords of the Council desire me to go to the frontiers to establish order there.

The marriage being consummated, and everything conducted in right and due order, they presented me with the government of the realm, that I might regulate the police, especially on the English frontiers, on account of the murders, plunders, and larcenies which were there committed on both sides. To this I agreed; and accordingly, I took my departure from Edinburgh, along with the queen, who wished to accompany me to the castle of Borthwick, situated seven leagues from the town, where she intended to abide my return.

Arriving on the Border, I found the marauders so strong, that it was impossible for me to put them down, for which cause I instantly returned to Borthwick, where the said queen was, in order to assemble greater forces.

Sixth sedition.

Then the rebels, my enemies aforesaid, finding that I had taken the field with a small number of people, used every effort to surround and to slay me: for this reason, I suddenly departed, in order to gather together my friends, and the queen's faithful subjects; which I did so effectually, that I released the queen from the said castle, routed my enemies, and pursued them to Edinburgh, where they were received—the said city and castle deserting our cause and surrendering to them.

2000 men.

The Earl of Huntly and the Archbishop of St Andrews, with several other Lords of the Council, who were then in Edinburgh, armed themselves immediately, when they observed this chance, in order to defend themselves against the said rebels, and preserve the said city. This, however, they were unable to do, as the opposite party was stronger. Thus we found ourselves deceived in that quarter.

When the said earl and archbishop found that they could not resist the rebels, they, in order to save themselves, repaired voluntarily to the castle, stipulating that they should be at liberty to return whenever they pleased. But neither faith nor promise was kept with them.

Then the queen and myself, in order to deliver them, departed from the castle of Dunbar, with as great a number of soldiers and faithful subjects of her majesty as we could assemble in so short a time, and approached the said city of Edinburgh, within the distance of a German league. The said rebels came out of the city, and encamped opposite to us, at the distance of a cannon-shot.

The two armies in the field.

Shortly after, a gentleman from their side presented himself, and exhibited the principal causes of their appearance there, printed as follows: In the first place, in order to deliver the said queen from the captivity in which they said she was held by me; and, in the second place, in order to avenge the death of the king, of which I have spoken before, and of which I and mine were accused.

They state the causes which induced them to take the field.

I answered to the first point, that I held the queen in no captivity, but that I loved and honoured her with such humility as she deserved, for which I referred them to herself.

To the second, I constantly denied having participated in, or consented to, the death of his said majesty; and although I had been already sufficiently cleared of it, I presented myself anew, if there were any nobleman of honour and of irreproachable descent, who should accuse me of such a deed; and stated myself to be ready to defend my honour and my life on the spot, between the two armies, according to the letters which I had before published in Edinburgh, and the ancient customs of arms.

To which I received answer, that there was one called Lord Lindsay, who was willing to meet me in the field; but this the queen, and the Lords who were with her, did not find reasonable, for the following reasons: That the said Lord Lindsay was not of so great a parentage that he could compare himself to me, nor of such ancestry or house; and, moreover, that I was a husband worthy of the queen.

I accepted the challenge of Lord Lindsay.

I, however, so persuaded the queen and all the rest of them,

with many reasons in my just cause, that finally they consented that the combat should take place as aforesaid.

A little after, I went to the place appointed for the said combat, there to abide my enemy, where I remained until very late in the evening, he not showing himself, nor making any sign of his intending to appear, as I shall prove, whenever it shall be necessary, by the testimony of a thousand gentlemen, on pain of losing my life. When the night approached, I prepared myself to give them battle, and put my harquebussiers in order for marching against them: they, on their side, did the same.

He who offered battle to me did not make his appearance.

The queen observing me and her good subjects on the one side, and the rebels on the other, ready for the attack, the Laird of Grange (who was one of the best warriors among our opponents) put her in mind that he and his associates were gathered together to deliver her majesty from the miserable servitude in which I kept her,—a thing which she denied openly in the presence of them all.

The queen's answer respecting the captivity in which they said I held her.

We thus being ready for the charge on the one side, and they on the other, the queen, seeking by all means to prevent blood being spilled on either side, went over to them, accompanied by the said Laird of Grange, intending to negotiate with them, and accommodate matters amicably; and, inasmuch as she expected that she could go and meet them in safety without any treason, and that no person would presume or dare seize her person, she desired me not to advance with my soldiers. I then requested her to consider well what she did, and to take care that she should not be a loser by her goodness; for I sufficiently knew their hearts to be full of treason, and that, if she did not consent to their demands, they would take her prisoner, and afterwards deprive her of her authority, without any just cause. I likewise entreated her to retire to Dunbar, and let us fight for her just quarrel, according to the zeal which we had for her honour and service, and the love we bore to the public good and the tranquillity of our country. But finding it impossible for me to dissuade her from her purpose, or incline her to listen to any remonstrance, I requested her to have herself furnished with a safe-conduct, with certain conditions which I should

The queen holds a conference with the rebels.

The counsel I gave the queen not to confide in their fair promises.

A guarantee for the queen's

safety is demanded. propose to them. The said Laird of Grange, who appeared in behalf of the opposite party, did himself, in their name, give such a promise and assurance.

False assurances given to the queen. For it must be observed, that the said Laird of Grange stated that he was, for this only reason, delegated by all the others jointly, for offering the queen, as their superior, true homage, and for giving her assurance and safe-conduct, while going to meet them: he said, that every one of them, according to his degree and dignity, desired nothing more than to yield to her all honour and obedience (next after God) in everything which her majesty might be pleased to command. All this having been agreed upon, and promise given that it should be inviolably kept and adhered to, by both armies, in the presence of the nobility and commoners who were there on the spot, she desired me to return to Dunbar with my army, where she would shortly meet me herself, or at least send me word.

Thus I parted with her, she having requested me so to do, relying on the pledged faith and promises which they had given to her by word of mouth, as well as printed letters *(lettres imprimées)*. These things being considered, every one may clearly perceive that their intention was, has always been, and still is, unjustly to encroach on the authority and power of the queen their lawful princess; they themselves, under such a pretext (after having deprived her of her authority), wishing to govern the kingdom, and dictate the law to it universally.

The queen taken prisoner: After these transactions I parted with the queen, and she went to meet them, who instantly took her prisoner, and put her under a strong guard. They first carried her away to

brought to Edinburgh: Edinburgh Castle, where she only remained one night. The day following, they brought her to another castle, situated on

to Loch Leven. a small island called Loch Leven, thus preventing her from communicating with others, or receiving tidings from us, fearing lest we might make an attempt to deliver her from the said castle.

The Council assembles to deliberate Thus finding the long-meditated and treacherous plans of our enemies successful, we had a meeting with the following noble lords; first, in the western part of the country, and

afterwards in the north, and deliberated about every means by which her deliverance might be effected. about the queen's liberation.

The Duke of Chatelherault.

Earls.	*Bishops.*	*Lords.*
The Earl of	The Archbishop of	The Lords
Huntly,	St Andrews,	Herries,
Argyle,	Glasgow,	Setoun,
Crawford,	Dunkeld,	Oliphant,
Errol,	Aberdeen,	Boyd,
Mareschal,	Murray,	Borthwick,
Eglintoun,	Ross,	Gray,
Cassilis,	Dunblane,	Ogilvy,
Rothes,	Galloway,	Glammis,
Montrose,	Argyle,	Yester,
Caithness,	Brechin,	Sommervil,
Sutherland,	The Isles.	Drummond,
Monteith.		Lovat,
		Saltoun,
		Forbes,
		Elphinstoun,
		Fleming,
		Livingston.
	The Abbots of	
Arbroath,	Kilwinning,	Glencross,
Dunfermline,	Deir,	Corsraguel.
Melrose,	Kinross,	

We were all of opinion that it would be best to wait a little, and not be too hasty in pursuing them, they being at that time extremely furious, fearing lest we might wish to deliver the queen whom they detained, whose life would have been in danger if we had pressed them too hard.

Accordingly, all those who were present resolved unanimously, and those who were prevented from attending ratified that resolution by their letters and seals, that I should pursue my journey to France, through the kingdom of Denmark; where I could provide myself with everything which my The Council determines that I should go to France by way of Denmark.

situation would require; preparatory to sending soldiers into Scotland, both by sea and land. I was also to lay my complaint before the King of Denmark, and explain to him my whole case, being assured that this would induce the said king to give me his good counsel, assistance, and favour: and, in order to obtain this more readily, I was to offer him my service with all that I could command, and they were assured that the queen would approve of it. Yet, for more certainty, I actually obtained her opinion, which was, that she was perfectly pleased with what the Lords had advised me, desiring me to carry it into effect as speedily as possible.

I embark from the north of Scotland.

This being accomplished, I embarked on the northern coast of Scotland as aforesaid, intending to follow this counsel; and, on my road, having business to transact in the isles

I arrive in the Orkney Islands.

of Orkney and Shetland, I went thither, and remained there only two days. I landed in Shetland, where I found some vessels from Bremen and Hamburgh, and I wished to make

Land in Shetland.

an agreement with the masters of these vessels respecting the rate at which I should pay them a-month, as long as they should be in my service; for being in such a hurry, and so pressed, I could not provide myself with such vessels as I wished, and had only small vessels, such as I then could procure.

The agreement which I made with the Bremois, named Gerard Hemlin, was as follows: That I should pay him fifty silver dollars a-month for the time he served me; and if, during the said service, the vessel were lost, or even if I should wish to keep it myself, I was to pay him sixteen (hundred) dollars, and for his artillery, one hundred silver dollars, as will appear from the contracts made between us two. The same conditions were agreed to between the Hamburgher and me. But while I was on shore at the house of the receiver, some of my enemies arrived and separated my vessels, as I now shall state.

My enemies pursue me with four ships.

The rebels aforementioned had got together four vessels, well armed and equipped with fighting men and artillery, under the command of the gentleman aforesaid, of Grange and Tullibardin, who, at the break of day, entered the harbour in the said island, called *Bresse Sund*, where there lay four

of my vessels: and when the masters of the vessels perceived them, my captains and soldiers being on shore, they cut their cables, as also the ropes by which the boats were fastened, and retired to another harbour on the north of the said island, called Ounst.

In the mean time their leading vessel, which pursued us diligently, watched that one among my vessels which was the slowest sailer, and this they pursued: my vessel was ahead; the other followed. But it so happened that the enemy's vessel (pursuing mine which was not a good sailer) struck upon a sunken rock, together with mine, in such a manner that their said vessel, which was their best, and carried their flag, stuck fast; but mine, although somewhat damaged, got off. When I heard that my enemies were about to land, in order to pursue my people, I immediately embarked with them in the said harbour of Ounst, where I had never intended to stay, but only to make head against my enemies; but their three vessels came on me so unawares, and so pressed me, (as they had also done on a former occasion,) that I could not resist them. Thus I was compelled to set sail, and I ordered one of my ships (in which there was the remainder of my plate, wardrobe, and movables, which I had brought with me from the castle of Edinburgh) to go to a harbour called Schallowe, and there meet the Hamburgher aforesaid, and bring the ship after me; I keeping my course for Denmark as I had resolved. This the rest of my people, whom I had left in the said island, promised to do. The said rebels pursued me and pressed me in such a manner, that we continued fighting during three hours, and finally, by a cannon-shot, they cut off the main-mast of the best of my vessels: and suddenly there arose such a tempest from the south-west, that it was impossible for me to keep my said course, and I was driven upon the coast of Norway, where I was obliged to repair and victual my ships, which, on account of my hurried departure, were not provided with all that was needed.

Our engagement at sea.

My main mast shot away.

I reach the coast of Norway.

The day after my departure from Shetland, I arrived on the coast of Norway, in a place called Carmsund, whither I was brought in a vessel from Rostock, which had followed us

during the night, in order to conduct us the next day into the said harbour; for my pilots were not acquainted with the place. The captain of the vessel from Rostock did actually bring us into the harbour; and he sent us his boat for bringing one of our cables on shore.

In the mean time arrived Christen Olborg, captain of one of the King of Denmark's ships called the Bear, who asked us from whence we came, and whither we were going: to which the master of my ship answered, that we were noblemen from Scotland, intending to go to Denmark to serve his majesty. I ordered that the honour customary in the seas and jurisdictions of foreign princes should be done to him.

The said Captain Christen Olborg demanded to see our passports, or ship's papers, that he might know our charge. But I being in the same condition in which I am even now—that is to say, destitute and deprived of everything belonging to my rank, in consequence of having left one of my vessels, which I hourly expected—was unwilling to make myself known before I should have recovered it, and even to go on shore before I should arrive in Denmark: I, however, sent him one of my gentlemen, to inform him that, in consequence of the vigorous pursuit which had been set on foot against me in Scotland, I had not been able to take with me the certificates, or the ship's papers which he demanded, and that she [the queen] who ought to have furnished them, was detained in close captivity. Some time after, he desired that, if there were any person with me who could speak divers languages, he should come and pass the time with him; and to this I agreed.

The cause why I would not discover myself at first.

Item, he requested the master of my ship, and several others of our party, to come on board his ship, for the purpose of victualling our own, and accommodating us with other things necessary, giving us to understand that there was arrived a ship in the said harbour which had wherewithal to assist us: but having got them all over into his ship, he amused them the following night, speaking them fair, and then called the country people from the neighbourhood, requesting them to assist the King of Denmark's ships, there being arrived, as he conceived, some pirates and freebooters,

whom he wished to make prisoners, according to the orders he had from the king his master. He did not let this be known, however, to my people, whom he had with him in his said ship, but persuaded them that he would bring them up to Bergen only, in order to provide them with such things as they might need. The said king's ship was, in respect of numbers, greatly inferior to ours.

Moreover, he desired me to permit that eighty of my people might remain in his ship, not that he entertained any evil opinion or suspicion respecting us, but only that, with regard to provision, this arrangement was more convenient, as no provisions were to be had in that place for money; and he gave a promise to us on his honour, that he would let every one of us return to his ship, and take our departure whenever we pleased, (and this promise he gave to us, by written letters under his own seal,) and moreover assured us, that we should have a safe-conduct to go, without any impediment, wherever we pleased: but he kept none of these promises.

Captain Olborg's written promise broken.

Having complied with every part of his demands, he proceeded to separate our people, who amounted nearly to the number of one hundred and forty, breaking his pledged faith and promise, without our knowing any cause, as we had never offended his majesty, or done the least injury to any of his subjects, nor violated the laws of the sea, nor even taken the value of a penny without paying for it. I then declared who I was, and whither I intended to go; in spite of which, he continued to detain me as prisoner like the others, contrary to my expectation: for if I had any suspicion of this, I might have acted and conducted myself towards him and his followers in whatever way I pleased, being twice his superior in numbers.

Arrival in Bergen.

Arrived in Bergen, I desired Erich Rosenkrantz to let me obtain for my money proper vessels for the purpose of rowing me along the coast, (inasmuch as I was so sea-sick,) that I might as soon as possible reach Denmark, and requested him also to provide me with a passport. In the mean time, I remained during a whole month, sometimes in the castle, sometimes on board ship with my people; and during twenty days,

I several times took a walk through the town wherever I pleased: thus, if I had felt myself to be guilty of any crime, I had an opportunity to go wherever I listed. But I am thankful to the good Lord Rosenkrantz for the confidence he had in me.

I was deprived of my followers and then sent to Denmark, with only four or five of them.

Having long time waited for my passport, without which I would not depart, it was stated to me by some magistrates of the city, that Erich Rosenkrantz and the said magistrates had ordered that I should go with the ships of the said king to Denmark, it not being permitted that my people should follow me, unless it were four or five of them; and they dismissed the others, that they might go to Scotland, or even wherever they might please.

The ship which was to follow me arriving off the coast of Norway, instantly returns.

The vessel which I had sent to Shetland, (in which was my property, my plate, my wardrobe, and jewels,) in order to bring my people whom I left there, hearing, as she proceeded along the coast of Norway, that I was detained, and my people sent back, returned also. In this manner I have not only been detained and arrested, as well here as elsewhere, nearly four months and a half, contrary to my expectation, as I thought I was come among friends, although unprovided with a passport, but I have also been slandered, and accused unjustly by my enemies, and been deprived of all things which my rank requires. This, however, I consider of far less consequence than the contumelies and indignities which I have suffered in this prison, and that I am, without any cause, detained and hindered from prosecuting the business which I have in certain kingdoms with some princes and noblemen, for the liberation of the queen my princess, and, as I think, to our dishonour, injury, and ruin, by those of whom I had expected aid and assistance.

SECOND LETTER FROM JAMES, EARL OF BOTHWELL, TO THE KING OF DENMARK.

It not being permitted to me to speak in person to his majesty, nor to the Lords of his Council, to inform them of the cause why I undertook to visit this kingdom, I am constrained to

put in writing what I had indeed hoped to explain by word of mouth, and I desire this good Lord Peter Oxe, prime minister of the said kingdom, to present this my letter to his majesty. In the first place, there have occurred great troubles and disunions in Scotland, as well amongst the rulers as the commonalty of the said kingdom, because some of the said rulers have, under the cloak of religion, sought their private advantage, wishing in future, by such unlawful means and false pretexts, to reduce the kingdom under their power and authority; and for this cause the said kingdom is divided into two parties. The queen and myself having considered and understood that we could not appease them, nor put an end to this state of things by rigorous means without infinite calamities and great effusion of blood, we endeavoured to remedy it, and prevent such misfortune and evils by kindness: to this end the queen demanded security and safe-conduct from our adversaries for going and coming to them in order to consult and treat with them of means which should be acceptable to both parties, and which might, in the first place, serve to establish a perfect union and concord among her subjects, and be of utility and profit to the realm.

For this reason, our adversaries aforesaid, with their accomplices, promised to the queen the Lady Mary, and gave in writing their security and inviolable safe-conduct, which afterwards they falsified and broke when the said queen went to meet them, detaining her as prisoner, and then carrying her away to the castle of Loch Leven, where she is yet to this day, as is more fully declared in the writing which I made on my defence, which I desire may be delivered to his majesty, that he may know the intention and final will of the said queen and of the Lords of her Council,—being as follows:

In the first place, that I should request of his Danish majesty, as the queen's ally and confederate, aid, favour, and assistance in providing me with soldiers, and with ships for liberating her from captivity.

Item, for the expense which may be incurred, that I should offer his said majesty to surrender the Islands of Orkney and Shetland, free, quit, and without any hindrance

to the crown of Denmark and Norway, as they have been sometime heretofore.

Moreover, to the end that his Majesty and the Lords of his Council may be better assured of what is written above (of that which is stated in the writing which I made in my defence, as well as what here is briefly repeated,) I entreat his majesty to be pleased to have the letters of cession of the said Islands of Orkney and Shetland, prepared with such and so strict conditions, as his said majesty and the Council of the kingdom of Denmark shall deem most satisfactory and secure; and I do, in good faith, pledge myself, that the said letters shall be sealed by the queen, by myself, and by the Council of the kingdom of Scotland, and signed by every one of us with his own hand.

Whereupon I beseech his said majesty to be pleased to give me an answer, in order that I may fulfil the promise which I have given to the Queen of Scotland, and to the Council of that kingdom, at their earnest request; and also, that they may know what they have to hope in this their extreme distress and necessity.

At Malmöe, the 13th of January 1568.

APPENDIX E.

Sir A. Paulet to Sir F. Walsingham.

Mary, Q. of Scots, vol. xviii. 22.

S^r^. The honest man on Saterday last, the xxv^th^ of thys p̃nt, brought vnto me thys lytyll packett inclosed, wch beyng so lytyll as could be nothyng aunswerable to that wch youe expect, and was not lykelye to contayne anye great matter, and the daye of metynge betwene the Substytute and the honest man approchynge so nere, I thought good to staye the said packett yn my hands for these few dayes, to the end the honest man shold not thynke that I had intelligence wth the Substytute, and therfore sent the said packett agayne to the

honest man, the xxviiith of thys pñt, to be delyvered to the Substytute the xxixth, and so beyng retournyd vnto me by the Substytute I send yt vnto youe. Yt may please youe to signyfye vnto me what course I shall take wth the Substytute hereafter, wch restythe to be consideryd only by youe, who are acquayntyd wth the secrettes of the cause. And wheras youe requyre me to rewarde hym, I purpose to geve hym fyve poundes yf I heare not from youe to the contrarye by yor next lr̃es; but I wold thynk that yor friendes Substytute at London shold procure hys rewarde from thys Q., and yf yt be not sought at her handes, she shall have iust cause to thynk yll of yt. The treuthe ys, that he hathe had manye iourneys by thys occasyon, and therfore dothe deserve to be well recompensyd.

The xxviith of thys pñt, at x of the clock at nyght, I receavyd lr̃es from Mr Phelyppes of the xxvth, together wth two severale packettes, the lesser beyng the same wch I sent vnto youe the xxist of this instant, and wch was delyveryd to the honest man for the second messanger who attendyd hys aunswer at Lychfield, and yt ys very likely that thys packett was delyveryd for hym, because the daye appoynted for metynge betwene the honest man and the Substytute was not yet come. Howsoever, thys matter was mystaken by thys people or by the honest man, I see no daunger or inconvenyence yf we canne be content to have pacyence vntyll the arryvall of yor friend, who, as yt semythe, wylbe here shortlye. *Mr Phelyppes hathe sett downe a course for manye thynges to be done wch surely I dare not put yn executyon for feare of the warst,* wheryn I am also the more fearfull because yt semythe there ys hope that the iii^{de} of thys pñt great matter wyll come from thys people, wch myght be yn daunger to be stayed yf anye meane cause of suspycyon were mynystred by anye of the Agentes yn thys entercourse. Mr Phelyppes wold have the Substytute to sease vpon thys lytyll packett nowe retournyd from youe vnto me, whervnto the honest man wyll never assent wthout my especyll directyon, because he ys now to receave the said packett at my handes. Thys adventure myght brede manye daungers, and semythe to serve to no other purpose then therby to delyver a lr̃e from the Sub-

stytute to Curle, the said lr̃e contaynyng no matter that requyrethe especyall haste, and wch may not be done more safely by yor friend at hys cumyng. All ys nowe well, thankes be to god, and I shold thynk my selfe very vnhappye yf vpon anye instructyons to procede from me thys entercourse so well advauncyd shold be overthrowen. I have therfore resolvyd to open the retournyd packett, and to delyver only to the honest man the lr̃e for the second messanger theryn contayned, reservyng the rest according to Mr Phelyppes directyon, so as yf anye questyon growe therof hereafter [wch ys not lykelye], yt shalbe sayed that the Substytute fyndynge the said packett yn the honest man's handes seasyd vpon yt, and toke out therof what pleasyd hym. Thus youe see that I am curyous to conserve as well myselfe as the cause out of peryll or hazard therof, wheryn I am the more bold because I see nothyng yn the other course that pressythe, and yet beyng myscaryed betwene the Substytute and the man myght bryng immynent daunger.

The honest man belevythe, verely, that thys second messanger came by directyon from yor friend, because he bryngethe a trewe token wch was that yn suche a place yor friend gave hym two Angells, and tellythe me farther that the second messanger semyd to myslyke greatly that thys Q. delayed to aunswer hym, and sayed that hys busynes wold not permytt hym to tarye so long yn these partes, but concludyd that he wold fetch fresh lr̃es, and wold retourne the fowerth or fyfth of thys next monethe of July. He callythe hym selfe Barnes, and sayethe [untrewly I doubte not] that he ys nerely alyed to Sr Water Aston and Mr Rychard Bagott. And thus I commytt youe to the mercye of the Almyghtye, who gave youe strengthe of bodye and mynde to overcome the troubles of thys crokyd tyme. From Chartley the xxix^th^ of June 1586.

Yo^r^ most assuryd poore friend,

A. POULET.

The honest man bryngethe to the Substytute at thys tyme two Angells from thys Q.: wch surely I think shold have been delyveryd long before, and I marvell that the rewarde ys so slender, *doutyng least the honest man hathe kept the better*

part for hymself. I fynde that the honest man hath played his part at thys tyme very well wth the Substytute, accordyng to my instructyons.

Addressed:—To the Right Honorable Sr Fraunces Walsyngham, Knyght, her Maties pryncypall Secretarye.

Endorsed:—29 June, 1586, from Sr Amias Poulett to S^{r} Fr. Walsingham.

S^{r}. Youe have sett downe a very reasonable and probable course yn yor lr̃es as thynges appeare vnto youe there, *but I fynd here, by reason of the cyrcumstances, so manye difficultyes as I dare not procede to the executyon of yor directyon yn alle thynges,* wch I forbeare the rather because I fynde nothyng yn yor lres that pressythe, and do retourne yor packett vnto youe inclosed hereyn. I have wryten more at lengthe to Mr Secretarye, and thus wyllyng to send a newe packett vnto youe wth spede, I praye youe excuse these short lynes, wch shal be longer another tyme. From Chartley the xxixth of June 1586. Vol. xviii. 23.

Yo^{r} assuryd friend of old acquayntance,

A. POULET.

Addressed:—To my very good friend Mr Thomas Phelyppes, Esquyer.

Endorsed:—29 June 1586, from Sr Amias Poulett.

APPENDIX F.

GILBERT GIFFORD to SIR F. WALSINGHAM.

(State Papers, Scotland; Mary Queen of Scots, 1586, vol. xviii. No. 40.)

Righte Honorable.

Barnes hathe not yet appeared in anie of his frequented places, so that I thinke he came not as yet to towne. I knowe not whether he hathe bin wth the Ambassador, for I dare not goe thether till suche time as I bringe the packet wth me. I am assured he shall no sooner come to the towne but I shall heare of him, and needes he muste come, for I have his letters wth me fro ⊖.

I trust Mr Philips will meete the saied packet by the waie, and ℙuse it, that it neede no delaie in deleverie.

Tuchinge the practisse in hande. Before my laste cominge over in discoursse wth Morg., I smelled somethinge afar of, and he toulde me that he had sent one to solicite matters heare, ℙmisinge me that in time I shoulde knowe all, as occasion shoulde serve, for it is theire custome to discover thinges by litle and litle, albeit they truste one never so muche.

Now, yesterdaie, by greate inquirie, one Balart founde me oute, (I never was well acquainted wth him,) but he toulde me that he had saughte me greatlie, and that he knewe my endevourez thereughlie in the behalfe of the cause, and that he purposed verilie to have comen to me in the contrey, for, saied he, I thoughte you were there. After greate intertainemetez at the lengthe he bracke wth me into great complainte of Morg. and Charl. P., sainge that they ℙmised him intelligence verie ofte, and that he never harde frō thē since his cominge over; hereof I gave him some reasons of theire delaie.

Then he toulde me that at his cominge over he was directed to me, and that findinge me not, he was in greate ℙplexite, thankinge God that we were met together to be an helpe one

to another. He toulde me that he was on Satturdaie nighte wth the Ambas., and he expectethe letters dailie.

But, saied he, if they will not ℔forme that they ℔mised, we will doe at the leaste oure partez, by wch wordez I ℔ceved that I [1] thoughte mè privie to the course.

I asked him what was to be done on oure partez; he replied that I muste needez obtain of ⊖, her hande and seale to allowe of all that shoulde be practissed for her behalfe, w^th^oute the w^ch^, saied he, we laboure in vaine, and these men will not heare us.

I answered that it was a matter of greate importance, and that we shoulde expecte Morg. and P. to doe it; he saied the matter woulde groe longe, and that he was in great daunger.

Well, saied I, in my opinion this was never obtained hitherto by anie man, and the grantinge thereof will be harde, but what ℔suasions, what ℔babilitie of successe can you leaie before ⊖, whereby he [2] maie be moved to graunte it; saied he, I will undertake w^th^in fortie daies to ℔cure his libertie.

Well, saied I, let us thinke of it, and to-morrowe I will answer you; so he parted oute of towne, and lefte his man wth me for answer, wch he is marvelouse erneste in.

This Balart is the onlie man used in this practise, whatever it be, wch I cannot thereughlie discover the firste daie; but in time it will be easie, for he desirethe my companie and helpe therein.

What youre Ho. thinkethe good I shall answer him; I desire to be enformed, and howe far I shall joine wth him, and keepe him companie, wch doinge it is unpossible but I shall discover all.

He cõplained muche of Sr T. Tressŏ and my Cousin Talbot, for not onlie they would not heare him, but threyned to discover him; and, saiethe he, *unlesse we obtaine that frõ ⊖ all is but winde.*

I besiche youre Ho., so soone as the packet shall arrive, that it be cõvoied to me by this bearer, before wch time I cannot goe to the Ambas.

Balart toulde me that youre Ho. had an inklinge of some thinges, especiallie of the Amb. intelligence w^th^ ⊖; youre Ho.

[1] *Sic* in original. He evidently means "he thought me," &c.

[2] *Sic* in original.

hathe some verie corrupted men about him, wherunto greate regard is to be taken. He toulde me that Philips was gone to Chartley for the removinge of Nawe and Pie.

I truste youre Ho. cõsiderethe howe necessarie it is to entertaine D. G.[1] and Gratley.

For herby they be ꝑsuaded that theire is no other dealinges of myne, but that onlie otherwise it were unpossible but I shoulde be suspected.

D. G. cominge over woulde coulor me muche, as allso I can knowe his whole thoughtes, and no doubte he woulde be greatlie emploied, so that by him I shoulde understande all theire courses, for he can hide nothinge frõ me. Thus ꝑtestinge before God that nothinge shall passe my handes and hearinge but youre Ho. shall soone understand it, besiche the Almightie longe to ꝑtecte youre Ho. This xj of Julie,

Youre honor's faithfull servante,

G. G.

Indorsed:—To the Righte Honorable Sr Frauncis Walsinghã, Knighte, Her Matys Principall Secretarie, 11 July 1586. From G. G., several Advertis.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and authentic copy.—H. J. SHARPE, Assist.-Keeper of Public Records.

9th August, 1873.

(I have put into italics the passages relating to the handwriting of the Queen of Scots.—J. H.)

APPENDIX G.

(The following fragment of a paper on Adversity is entirely in the handwriting of the Queen of Scots. It is so full of corrections and erasures as to be in parts illegible, and it has been evidently thrown aside in a wholly unfinished state. It bears no date, but is preserved among the letters in the Re-

[1] D. G., apparently his uncle, Doctor Gifford.

cord Office of the year 1580. It was probably seized along with all other papers in her possession at Chartley in August 1586.—See Mary Queen of Scots, vol. xi. No. 37.)

Celuy qui desire que son œuvre ne puisse a bon droict etre moquee ou blasonnee dun chasqun doyt ce me semble avant tout aultre respect fayre si bonne ellection de la matiere quil pretend trayter que lon ne luy puisse dire cest adaige encien *ne sutor ultra crepidam* voila pourquoy laysant trayter de filosofie aux filosofes des loyx aux legislateurs aux poetes leur chansons enrichies de fictions metamorfoses histoyres et profitables enseignements et brief donnant aynsin lieu a chesqun de rendre quelque tesmoignasge celon sa vocation de ce en quoy plus il auroit verse et profitay jay pence ne pouvoyr meulx emploier mon temps fuiant oysiuite ores que ie nay le moyen dexercer la charge en la quelle dieu ma apellee des le berceau que descire de la diversite des afflictions et des diferents euenements dicelles et de ceste entreprise personne a mon aduis ne me scauroit iustement reprendre pour mestre subiect si familier et dont iay autant dexperience que personne de nostre asge mesmement de ma qualite et duquel aumoingns les beneuolles pouront tirer matiere dexercer leur charite acomplissent ce commendement qui nous est donne de pleurer auuesques les pleurents principallement quant ilz vendront a considerer en quelles afflictions nous sommes iournellement subiects deuchoyr dont aussi ils prendront occasion en temps de soy retourner a dieu pour par oraysons et deuotes prieres destourner son ire de nous. Et les afflisges comme moy qui viendront a lire ce petit discours et voirent les exemples de ceulx qui ont souffert pareilles miseries dauuant eulx et quant et quant trouueront que leur remede a tousiours este de retourner a dieu qui les inuitera den fayre le semblable mays pour; quil i a plusieurs generes daflictions les unes fons plus viuement linterieur de lhomme partie la plus noble et pour ce respect plus dangereuses les autres moyns qui seullement apartinent le corps, iay este daduis pour ne rien confondre de duire chesque espece d'aduersite a par soy, commencant aux plus grieues et dont ceste malheureuse fin a ceulx qui obstines en leur malice par ce delaysses de dieu en

ont este persecutes iusques a fayre mauayse fin ce desperents eulx mesmes ou ne voulant ce reconoitre et amender et de touts ceulx si nous metrons poyne damener tousiours quelques exemples tant de lecriture que des enciens etenigues ou grands personasges modernes et apres ce concleu puis nous deduirons au contrer de ceulx qui estant trauailles de semblables ou mesmes aduersites les ont receues comme iustes et fauorables chatiments de ce bon dieu et pere que ils reconoissent auuoir si souuent et grieuement offence et par ce moyen les tribulations ont servi a ceulx issi de fournese pour esprouuer leur vertu comme est le fin or damesques lemanays et mesmes de leur fayre ouurir les yeulx par auuant auuegles a ce conoitre eulx mesmes et leur feuilte qui est le commencement de tout bien et moyn daprendre a despriser ce monde et ces vanites pour ce resigner du tout soubs et au bon plesir de leur creatur qui en recompance leur a donnes des benedictions mondenes et spirituelles qui valent trop meulx et puis nous conclurons auuesques la grace de Dieu.

Or dongues suiuvant ma protestation precedante se metre au premier rang des aduersites pur la plus grande qu'homme donne ou puisse auuoir la mavayse et coulpable consience car cest ce per qui tousiours ronge et pour bien ou felisite que puisse posseder celui qui en est vexe iamays il na repos ni ne scauroit dormir en repos; tesmoyns denis le tirant et tant d'autres car comme dit Cicero *in consciencia mille testes* et de ceste pernisieuse peste fut mene au desespoyr iusques a ce fayre tuer par des siens Abimelec apres auoir tue ces freres estant seulement bien peu blesse dune thiule qune femme lui layssa choyr sur la teste Achitofel voiant son conseile nestre receu que faulsement auoit baille contre le Roy Davit ce pendit luymesmes, Zambri[1] qui comme traytre tua son Roy au bout de 7 iours ce fit lui mesmes miserablement brusler en la meson Royale; et le pire de tous Judas ne fut il ateint de ce malheur quant reietant les trente deniers au temple il sescria auuoir tray le sang iuste et inocent. May laysants la bible voyons ung Magus qui ayant tue Marc Marcelle aut telle horreur du fet quil sen fit autant a luymesme; Catuliua de mesme voiant sa conjuration descouuerte ayma mieult ce priuer

[1] See 1 Maccabees, ii. 26.

de vie que soufrir tel remors et opbrobre ; et entre les modernes lises P Jouue et ce quil dit du tirant Patauinus et ce que ie dis qui ambitieulx a honneur ce sentant acuses oprins [1] ou soupseues dagun acte contre ou au preiudice disceluy se sont tant oublies de la justice de dieu qui enfin deliuure les inocents de tout disfasme et que esface les pesches de ceulx qui en humilitay ce retournent vers lui celon la promesse quil nous a faicte quant il dit vous tous qui êstes charges venes a moy et ie vous deschargeray que inpassiens de telle malheur qui veritablement est grand car notre seigneur mesme ce montra curieulx de sa reputation quant il enquist de ces disciples de ce que lon disoit de luy. . . .[2] prenons lexemple de Cayn qui euiueulx de lhonnheur que son frere auoit receu par le tesmoinasge que dieu randit dauuoir son sacrifice plus agreable que le sien au lieu damander le sien et par cela recouurin pareil grace il fut si transporte d enuye quil comut un crisme veritablement digne dinfamie car il respandent le sang de son frere de quoy estant repris par dieu qui tousiours est prest de nous admonester en temps de nous retourner a luy : au lieu de reconoitre sa faulte refusa de sumilier ou demander pardon disan quiconque me trouvera me tuera o trop superbement conoiteux de lombre de lhonnheur qui au lieu discelui perds le vray honneur cest fayre comme le chien qui tenant une piece de cher en la bousche la quelle dans leau luy samble plus graue il la laysse choyr pour courir a son hombre qui nest rien.

Jeroboam aussi estant repris par le prophete publiquement luy semblant telle remontrance de son pesche deshonorable commit un crisme au lieu desparer les precedents vrayment abomiable commandant que le St. homme fut tue Ne ce souuenant point que le vray deshoneur cest de pescher . . .[3] herodes de mesme cuidant cascher son vilainie inceste que St Jan publioyt pour leu dieuerti par ses reprehensions fut a la persuation de sa malheureuse et incestueuse conpaigne de decapiter ce St. et digne prophete mays quoyque ne luy en aduent il double deshonneur car son pesche en fut plus publiquement conneu et adioustant ce meustre il refusa la grace et pardon de dieu delaquelle priue il mourut miserablement

[1] Illegible. [2] A sentence here illegible. [3] Illegible.

et son nom nous demeure en examble de vilayne et abominable vie le peuple des juifs ne pouuoit souffrir telle vergoigne destre reprivis par St Etiene puis le lapiderent procurants par ee moyen leur eternelle ruine et la louange imortelle de celuy qui cependant prioit dieu pour ceulx. Car de tout autre il ia remede veu que dieu nous dit que si nos pesches estoyent plus rousge quescarlate il les randra plus blancs que niege et aux inocents leur glorie en cera plus grande si ils suportent ceste croix passiament; et ie diray de Scipion lAfricain qui ce voiant a tort accuse vers sa patrie cuidant evader le desplesir de ce voir mepris des siens sadonnant a volontere vie au grand d'exil preiudice de la republique a la quelle pour son honneur il ne devvoit pour nul respect manquer au besoing autrement ne scauroit il etre dit bon citoien qui est le plus honorable titre quhomme puisse guaigner sauf celuy de bon chrestien. Coriolanus cheut en pareil ereur et pis car il de desespoir ce fist enemi de sa patrie pour laquelle ruiner il vint avvesques une grande armee ou les fames ces parentes montrarent plus dignes citoyens que lui que esfassa par ceste inpassience daduersite ces faytes precedents digne de louange: ie vous parle des chrestiens et entre autres dun qui mest venu a la memoire pour lavvoir leu na pas long temps; il i eut dong ung nomme Pierre des Vignes chanselier de lempire homme de basse condition mays toutefeys de si bon entendement et docte quil fut pour ce trouue digne de telle charge et qui plus est si porta si bien que lempereur Federic esmu de sa sufisance et fidelite luy donoit tout credit et autorite de fayre et defayre ce quil vouldroit en son conseil, ce qui mut chose commune aux cœurs des grandes que faulcement luy suposerent lettres et tesmoigns iuuentes et subornes qui laccuserent vers lempereur dauuoir intelligence avvesques le Pape Inoscent[1] auquels ils feignoynt quil auoit reuele ces segrets et communique ces lettres lempereur trop soubdayn i prestant foy luy fit creuer les yeulx de quoy le pauure homme ne ce sentoit sauf que de ce voir mesprise dun chasqun et priue de lhonneur. Que sa

[1] Pope Innocent IV., who deposed the Emperor Frederick II.—See M. Paris, 663.

fidelite lui auuoit mene duquel luy fit si grieue que sa bonne cause il en fit une mauayse car ne pouuant viure en telle ignominie et mauayse reputation il le fit mesner en place ou lempereur entrent en leglise le pouuoit voir et la sasquit un bon fasme de honneur ce donnant de la teste contre un pillier de fasson quil si tua a l'instant.

Mays quoy oseres ie vous metre dauuant tes yeulx vn noble et vertueulx prince et auquel ie me sents honoree appartenir[1] qui ne pouuant soufrir vn petit deshonneur saquit vn blasme et note en son illustre nom de mauais subiect en pire terme quil ne me seroit honneste lapeler mays quoy enfin il proce a si amnant pour venger une inure que perit foy son nom cest ces biens et son nom y la comment il en prend de ne receuoir les afflictions et chastiments de dieu en humilitay et passience quels que soient; et pour nestre trop prolix sur tant de diuers points que ie desire trayter nous parlerons dela et ne doyt le chrestien a qui seullement nest permis murmurer des verges de dieu ayns pancer quil apris meriter et que il ni a crisme ni deshonneur que samandant et en faysant penitance ne puisse ettre effasce veu que dieu nous dit que si noz pesches estoyent plus rousges quescarlate si a nous netient il les randra plus blancs que nesge et si nous sommes inocents notre recompence en cera plus grande et nottre gloire plus excelente dauuoir patiamment suporte la croix qui nous est impossee pour auguementer notre merite et nous esprouver.

et toutefoys o quel malheur nous verons tous les iours que pour cest honneur que les hommes ont forge en leur testes, les plus sasges et vertueulx et grands personnasges perdront lavie et hasarderont lame et a la petit dun demantir ou parolle legierement dite ne feront consience layssant la loy de dieu apart comme etrangere non seullement de cherscher leur reuenge particuliere mays de tourner. . . . estats sans desubs dessubs iour si peu de chose quire parole qui nest que vent et la quelle celuy qui lauroit dite volontiers sendediroit si dautre part ceste loy enemye des hommes de celle de Jesus ne leu destournoit. Helas et que nous aurons en respondre ung iour qui permetons le prince du monde tant regner sur le

[1] I do not know to whom she here alludes.

troupeau que nous auons eusi estroite du grand bergier celeste dieu le fasche car ien suis pour ma part en grande pencement. Mays cependant cest temps meintenant de parler dun autre point qui rafflisge pas peu a mon aduis toute personne de bon naturel et qui a quelque chose de magnanimite. Dieu comme le bon pere de famille diversement distribue ces tallents cest ascauoir ses graces et qui les rescoit et ne les mit a proufit est deschasse et reuuoye a la poyne eternelle et celui qui les fayt profiter en resoyut double loyer et est mis et apeles en la ioye infinie comme nous enseigne la paraboll de lhomme riche qui allant enquerir un royaume layssa a lung de ses seruiteurs trois talents lautre deux et lautre une S.M. xxv. s. luc xix or comme dit Sta omnia que scripta sunt nostra doctrina scripta sunt

Comme humilitay est le vertu le plus plesant a dieu celui dont toutes autres prenent racine uiroissent es perfection et source et augmentation de tout vice malheur et pesche mays toutefoys si fault il auuoir esgnard et auuesques prudent iugement considerer que lun ne se pouuoit euiter lon sabisgner en laultre iusques a tomber en la desagreable et ville fosse de pusilanimite chose trop contrayre aus esprits genereulx tels que doyuent etre ceulx qui par la prouision diuine sont apeles a tenir sceptre regnance et autorite sur le peuple de dieu

forsan et hæc olim meminisse iuuabit la douleur decuba de porsia de dido.

orayson de ieremy chapitre v.

nous naysons e pleurons.

la pierre reiectee des massons sera mise omnia que scripta sunt ad nostram doctrinam

venes vous tous qui estes charges ie dit le queur le prefete qui sennioyt de viuant et son hay fort la mort pour la courge les lamentations de ieremie pour son peuple

le seaulme quant nous estions en babilonie es lessons complaintes de iob

pleurs de dauit pour son fils et pour son banissement
dieu pleurant pour son amy le lasser
et larbre de la croyx quant leloy
miserere mei saltem
beati qui lugent
flere conflentibus
beati qui sitiunt
Il est commande de porter le fayx les vns des autres.

(It was evidently the intention of Mary, from her allusion to Hecuba, Portia, and Dido, as well as from the various detached texts of Scripture with which the paper closes, to have continued the theme. The original spelling is preserved, and it will be perceived that she very rarely employs capitals, and that no accents are marked throughout. Some of the words it seems to be impossible to make out, but the general scope and tendency of her reflections are intelligible enough. They exhibit in a remarkable degree her strong religious convictions, and her extensive acquaintance with history, both sacred and profane.)

INDEX.

ALAVA (de), Don Frances, writes to Philip of Spain that Queen Mary is anxious to come to France, i. 282.

Albret (d'), Jean, Calvinist Queen of Navarre, ii. 136.

Alençon, Duke of, intended husband of Queen Elizabeth, ii. 185, 229—death of, 281.

Alexander II., King, forbids the Papal legate to enter Scotland, i. 4.

Allen, Dr William, his seminary at Rheims, ii. 224.

Alloa, Queen Mary's conduct at, i. 436.

Almond river, i. 307.

Alva, the Duke of, his butcheries in the Netherlands, i. 14—applied to for troops by Mary's friends, 497—seizes English ships and property at Antwerp, in retaliation for the seizure of his bullion by Queen Elizabeth, ii. 44—consequences to the Netherlands, 45—prepares to assist Queen Mary, 46—disapproves of the Norfolk marriage, 52—combination to crush, 136.

Amboise, castle of, i. 38—Huguenot conspiracy of, 34, 38.

Amville (d'), Count, i. 70.

Angus, Earl of, i. 6, 9—earldom of, given to Morton's nephew, 300—Earl of, with other outlawed nobles, enters Scotland and advances on Stirling, ii. 312.

Anjou, Duke of, defeats Coligni at Moncontour, i. 500—makes an offer of marriage to Elizabeth, ii. 17—alleged discovery by Walsingham of a secret project for his marriage to Mary Queen of Scots, 37.

Antwerp, capitulation of, ii. 319.

Argyll, Earl of, joins Murray in a conspiracy to murder Darnley and seize the queen's person, i. 108—plunders Lennox, 113—is one of the Lords of Secret Council before whom the depositions of Darnley's murderers were taken, 245—is implicated in the murder of Darnley by the depositions of French Paris, 249—and by Ormiston, 260—his energy in Queen Mary's interest, 308—he meets with Huntly and other nobles at Hamilton, 350—his protestation regarding Darnley's murder, 369 — takes arms for the queen, 485—conspires against Regent Morton, ii. 203.

Aristocracy, declining power of, towards the close of the fifteenth century, i. 1.

Armada, the Spanish, ii. 480—reaches Calais roads, 482—English fire-ships sent against them, 483—is pursued to the Firth of Forth, 484.

Arran, Earl of, chosen governor of Scotland, i. 12—made Duke of Chatelherault, 16—resigns the regency of Scotland, *ib.*

Arran, Earl of, son of the Duke of Chatelherault, i. 28—his proposed marriage with Queen Elizabeth, *ib.*—rumoured expedition to France by, 39—occasions a scandal by keeping a mistress in Edinburgh, 80—accuses himself and Bothwell of treason, 81.

Arran, James Stewart, Earl of, arrests Ruthven, Earl of Gowrie, and defeats his conspiracy, ii. 269—becomes virtually master of Scotland, 271—is regarded with suspicion both by Mary and Elizabeth, *ib.*—is denounced by the Reformers as a profligate, a tyrant, and an atheist, 272—has an interview with Lord Hunsdon, 275—espouses the cause of Queen Mary, 311—his flight on the advance of Angus and his faction, 313.

Articles, the Book of, copy of, from the Hopetoun MS., i. 523.

Arundel, Earl of, one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, i. 427—a prisoner in the Tower, ii. 83—dies in the Tower, 266.

Arundel, Sir John, a party to the conspiracy of Ridolphi, ii. 48.

Assembly of the Kirk demands the trial of the queen's uncle and brother, i. 81—declares that idolatry cannot be tolerated in the sovereign any more

than in the subject, 107—declares the restoration of the consistorial jurisdiction of the Archbishop of St Andrews a violation of the laws of the realm, 177—the meeting of, a fortunate occurrence for the insurgent lords, 353 — collision between the insurgent lords and the queen's adherents prevented by, 355—protests against the banishment of John Durie, ii. 245.

Atholl, Earl of, no party to the bond in favour of Bothwell, i. 305—signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, 342 — conspires against Regent Morton, ii. 203—appointed Chancellor, 204—dies of poison after an entertainment given by Morton, *ib.*

Attila, John Knox compared with, i. 23.

Aubigny, Lord, arrives in Scotland, and is made Earl of Lennox by the young King James, ii. 207.

Aubigny, Earl of Lennox, bond for the overthrow of, ii. 245—his indecision and flight on hearing of the seizure of the king at Ruthven Castle, 247—his death, 248.

Aumale (d'), Duke, uncle of Queen Mary, i. 32 — accompanies Queen Mary to Scotland, 70—death of, ii. 174.

Austria, Don John of, approved by Alva as a husband for Queen Mary, ii. 52 —his victory over the Turks at Lepanto, 86—a suitor for Queen Mary's hand, 187—his career and character, 188—his scheme to invade England and liberate Mary, 190—takes possession of Namur, 194—defeats William the Silent, 195—left to his own resources by Philip of Spain, 196—becomes despondent and dies, 197.

Aynslie's supper, subscribers to the bond at, in favour of Bothwell, i. 302 —represented in the Book of Articles as given in Holyrood Palace, 442—copy of the bond subscribed at, from MS. in Cotton Library, 576.

Babington, Anthony, his plot for the assassination of Queen Elizabeth, ii. 334—his relations with Gilbert Gifford and other conspirators, 341—alleged letter of Queen Mary to, 344—his letter to Queen Mary, 348-351—its inconsistencies and contradictions, 352 —his apprehension, 382—his trial and confessions, 397—his accomplices, 398 —his declaration, 401—his execution, 403—dying speeches of accomplices of, *ib.*

Bacon, Sir Nicolas, advises Queen Elizabeth to assist the Lords of the Congregation secretly, i. 32—objects to the Scottish expedition, 51—is one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, 427—opposes Queen Mary's restoration, ii. 17.

Bailly, Charles, a messenger of Ridolphi, arrested at Dover and put to the torture, ii. 55.

Balfour, Sir James, draws up the bond against Darnley, i. 166—is a member of the Secret Council before whom the depositions of Darnley's murderers were taken, 245—is implicated in the murder of Darnley by the depositions of French Paris, 249—is implicated in the murder of Darnley by Ormiston, 260—is placarded as one of the murderers of Darnley, 278—his verification of the copy of the bond subscribed at Aynslie's supper sufficient to discredit its authenticity, 303—holds the castle of Edinburgh, 334—comes to terms with Maitland, *ib.*—is desired by Queen Mary on no account to surrender the castle of Edinburgh to the rebels, 340 — Buchanan's statement that he delivered the silver box containing Queen Mary's letters to Bothwell's messenger, 348— is bribed by Murray to surrender the castle of Edinburgh, 376—is described by Robertson as the most corrupt man of his age, *ib.*—signs the Act of Council accusing Queen Mary of the murder of her husband, 379—joins the party of the queen, 495.

Balfour, Robert, owner of the house at Kirk-of-Field, is implicated in Darnley's murder, i. 262.

Ballard, an English priest, and spy of Walsingham's, connected with the Babington conspiracy, ii. 341, 356, 381, 385—is the real leader of the Babington conspiracy, 406.

Balnaves, Henry, attends the Conference at York, i. 401.

Bannister, steward of the Duke of Norfolk, his confession produced against his master, ii. 103.

Beale, Robert, visits Queen Mary at Sheffield Castle, and reports on her enfeebled state of health, ii. 235.

Beaton, James, Archbishop of Glasgow, Queen Mary's ambassador at Paris, i. 286—letters of Leslie (John), Bishop of Ross, to, ii. 504—letters of Secretary Raulet to, 506, 508, 516 — of Maitland of Lethington to, 510—of Seton (Lord) to, 517—of Beatoun (Mr) to, 523, 526, 528, 530, 532, 533—of Queen Mary to, 536—of Arnault (Mr) to, 537—of Ogilvie (Lord) to, 539, 541, 550—of Douglas (George) to, 544—of Bruce to, 546—of Lennox (Duke of) to, 552—of Mendoza (Don Bernardino de) to, 555—of Secretary Nau to, 558, 560.

Beaton, Cardinal, his influence after the

death of James V., i. 12—his conduct compared with that of contemporary rulers, 13—his murder, *ib.*—he deserves rather to be commended for his moderation than denounced for his barbarity, 14—is asserted by Knox to be the father of Queen Mary, 49.

Bedford, Earl of, threatens to attack Lord Hume, i. 117—his letter to Cecil regarding Darnley's murder, 245—is one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, 427.

Bellenden, Lord Justice-Clerk, i. 245.

Berwick, treaty of, between Elizabeth and the Congregation, i. 40.

Beton, Archibald, the alleged bearer of the first letter from Mary to Bothwell from Glasgow, i. 190.

Beton, James, his statements contradict those of Maitland as to his alleged interview with Queen Mary before her departure for Lochleven, i. 345.

Binning, John, servant of Archibald Douglas, his trial, conviction, and confession, i. 262.

Bishop, Thomas, story of his letter to Sir James Melvill, i. 324.

Blackadder, John, tried for the murder of Darnley, i. 354.

Blackadder, William, tried for the murder of Darnley, i. 354.

Blois, entry of Queen Mary into, i. 33—treaty of, ii. 135.

Bolton Castle, i. 190 — Mary (Queen) prisoner in, 399—Mary's letter from, charging Murray and his accomplices with the murder of her husband, 461.

Book of Articles, the, production of, at the Westminster Conference, i. 431—its contents examined, 434—it furnished Buchanan with materials for his 'Detection,' 445—copy of, from the Hopetoun MS., 523.

Bordeaux, John de, accused of being connected with the murder of Darnley, i. 278.

Borthwick Castle, Bothwell and Mary at, i. 333.

Bothwell, Adam, Bishop of Orkney, anoints King James VI. at his coronation, i. 366—attends the Conference at York, 401.

Bothwell, James Hepburn, Earl of, carries off the money sent by Queen Elizabeth to the Lords of the Congregation, i. 29—sends a cartel of defiance to the Earl of Arran, 30—disturbance occasioned by, 80—is arrested on the accusation of the Earl of Arran, 82—escapes, and quits Scotland, *ib.*—returns to Scotland, 105—summoned for trial and flees a second time, 106—allowed again to return to Scotland, 121—embraces the Protestant faith, *ib.*—along with Huntly and Atholl assails the followers of Morton in the palace on hearing the tumult occasioned by Riccio's murder, 139—joins the queen at Dunbar, 144—marries Lady Jane Gordon, 148—his ascendancy at Court, 155—left for dead in an encounter with John Elliot in Liddesdale, 158—the pardon of Morton attributed to his influence, 168—obtains the restoration of the consistorial jurisdiction of the Archbishop of St Andrews, with the view of getting a divorce from his wife, Lady Jane Gordon, 176—determines to marry Mary on the death of Darnley, *ib.*—statement in Murray's journal regarding his preparation of the house at Kirk-of-Field for Darnley, 189—his part in the murder of Darnley, 244—monstrous statements of French Paris regarding his intercourse with the queen, 253—shouts treason at the news of Darnley's death, 272—placarded as one of the murderers of Darnley, 278—order made by the Privy Council for his trial for the murder of Darnley, 289—his trial, 294—statement that he rode Darnley's horse to his trial, 296—the trial a solemn farce, *ib.*—his acquittal, 297—gives an entertainment to his friends, and asks them to subscribe a bond on his behalf, 301—copy of this bond preserved in the Cotton Library, 302—alleged letters of Queen Mary to him from Stirling, 308—carries off Queen Mary to his castle at Dunbar, *ib.*, 319—prepares to make her his wife, 320—obtains a divorce from Lady Jane Gordon, 322—applies to Mr John Craig to proclaim the banns between him and Queen Mary, 323—confederacy against him, 326—celebration of his marriage with Queen Mary, 328—insurgent nobles in the field against him, 333—is master of the two strongest fortresses in Scotland, *ib.*—resides at Borthwick Castle, *ib.*—escapes with Mary from Borthwick to Dunbar, 334—confronts the forces of the insurgent Lords at Carberry Hill, 335—proposal that he should fight with some one who should proclaim him the murderer of Darnley, *ib.*—declares he is ready to fight with any one of the insurgent lords, 336—flees from Carberry to Dunbar on the surrender of Mary, 337—remains at Dunbar for ten days after the queen had been sent to Lochleven, 355—sails for the north of Scotland after the proclamation offering a reward for his apprehension, *ib.*—proposed murder by Christopher Rokesby, 369—is at Spynie Castle,

ib.—commission for his apprehension issued to Murray of Tullibardine and Kirkaldy of Grange, *ib.*—pursuit of, to Orkney and Shetland, 370—made prisoner on the coast of Norway, 371—his death in Denmark, *ib.*—Mary accused in the Book of Articles of adultery with, before her husband's death, 437—despatch of a messenger to Denmark by Lennox for the surrender of, ii. 41—dispensation for his marriage with Lady Jane Gordon concealed from Queen Mary, 52—makes a formal declaration of his guilt and Queen Mary's innocence in the matter of Darnley's murder, 186—rumour of his death reaches England, *ib.*—suppression of his confession by Elizabeth, 187—memoir (the) of his affairs in the year 1568, preserved in the Royal Library of Drottningholm in Sweden, 576—his letter to the King of Denmark, 596.

Boulogne, peace concluded at, i. 16.

Bourbon (de), Anthony, King of Navarre, i. 37.

Bowes, Sir Robert, sent to Scotland to make a party against Lord Aubigny, ii. 208—hatches a plot for the assassination of Aubigny, Earl of Lennox, and the imprisonment of the young king, 209—fails in his attempt to criminate Aubigny, 210—quits Scotland, 211.

Boyd, Lord, Queen Mary's commissioner at the Conference at York, i. 401.

Brand, Rev. John, i. 259, 261.

Brechin Castle captured by the Regent Lennox, and thirty-four of the garrison hung, ii. 16.

Bristol, story of a ship brought to, for the abduction of Queen Mary, ii. 3.

Bromley, Solicitor-General, extraordinary statement by, at Norfolk's trial, ii. 113.

Brougham, Lord, his opinion that Queen Mary was justified in doing all that was alleged against her in order to obtain her liberty, ii. 374.

Bruce, Robert, sent to Spain as an agent of the Catholic party in Scotland, ii. 408.

Buccaneers, English, in the sixteenth century, ii. 57.

Buccleuch, Lady, witchcraft of, i. 278.

Buchanan, George, Mary's tutor, i. 85—statement in his 'Detection' regarding Queen Mary's behaviour at Alloa with Bothwell, 153—his account of her visit to Bothwell at Hermitage, 159—his monstrous fictions of the 'Detection,' 172—his statement that Queen Mary administered poison to Darnley, 170—depositions of French Paris taken by him, 256—yet they are rejected in his 'Detection' and History, 257—his contradictory statements regarding Darnley's murder, 266—his hatred of the house of Hamilton, 267—his statement that it was first rumoured that Murray and Morton were the murderers of Darnley, 277—his statement that Queen Mary twice gave poison to Darnley, 307—contradicts (flatly) the Stirling letters, 311—his detailed account of the alleged discovery of letters, said to have been written by Mary to Bothwell, proving her complicity in the murder of Darnley, 347—objections to the truth of his statements, 349—is chosen Moderator of the General Assembly, though a layman, 353—attends the Conference at York, 401—passages in his 'Detection' identical with the Book of Articles, 445—his 'Detection' published in London, and a copy of it presented to Queen Mary, ii. 80—English edition of his 'Detection' prepared, 81—his death, 248—his character and literary reputation, 249.

Buchanan, Thomas, sent to Denmark to negotiate for the surrender of Bothwell, ii. 41.

Burghley, Lord—*see* Cecil, Sir William.

Burton, Dr John Hill, on the Glasgow letters attributed to Queen Mary, i. 197, 199—his position that Mary and her accusers stood towards each other on a footing of moral equality, 316—his theory as to the supposed guilt of Queen Mary, ii. 493.

CAMDEN, his statement as to the first rumours on the death of Darnley, i. 277.

Campian, Edmund, tortured and executed with three other priests, ii. 242.

Carberry Hill, meeting of the forces of the queen and the insurgent nobles at, i. 335.

Carlisle, Queen Mary prisoner at, i. 398.

Carte, his remarks on Queen Mary's innocence, ii. 489.

Carwood, Margaret, said to have been married to Bastian Paiges, i. 231.

Castelnau, his account of the attempt to capture Queen Mary by the English squadron, i. 68, 70—sent to Edinburgh as ambassador of France, 115—advises Mary to make peace with the insurgents, *ib.*—his account of the demeanour of Queen Mary and her husband, 156—warmly espouses the cause of Mary in England, ii. 273—receives a promise that she shall be removed from Tutbury, 328.

Catholics, persecution of, i. 96—adultery no ground of divorce among, 243—rebellion of the English, 499—persecutions of, in England, ii. 223, 241, 265—penalties enacted against, 298—project for the re-establishment of the Catholic religion in Scotland by, 409.

Cecil, Sir William, approves of the proposed marriage of Queen Elizabeth with the Earl of Arran, i. 29—advises Elizabeth to assist the Lords of the Congregation, 31—is sent to Scotland, 47—arrives in Edinburgh, 49—his diplomatic triumph, 51—letter to Earl of Essex regarding Queen Mary's return to Scotland, 67—expresses approval of the conduct of Mary, 270—maintains paid informers in Scotland, 279—his crafty reply to Elizabeth on being taken to task for his inaction in the cause of Mary when confined at Lochleven, 364—hesitates as to the disposal of Queen Mary, 391—decides that she shall be treated as a prisoner until her trial, 392—is one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, 427—his real design to render the breach between Queen Mary and her subjects irreparable, 447—for this purpose forces Murray to the production of his proofs, *ib.*, 451—suggests that Queen Mary should be induced to resign her crown, 462—is unexpectedly checked in his designs by her refusal, 470—makes a fresh attempt, 472—declares that the case against Mary has failed, 473—refuses to allow her to depart though declared innocent, 477—remarkable letter of John Knox to, 508—his notes of a communication from Regent Murray, 509—intrusted with the negotiations for Mary's restoration, ii. 19—advises Elizabeth to a fresh inroad into Scotland, 13—has an interview with Mary at Chatsworth, 20—is made Lord Burghley, 35—alarmed at the prospect of Mary's restoration, 37—aids Sir John Hawkins in his deception of Philip of Spain, and Fitzwilliam in his deception of Mary, 61-63—is guilty of inventing the grossest calumnies against Mary, 78—requires hostages as security that Mary should be put to death by Regent Mar, 152—results of his treacherous and aggressive policy, 226—comparison of, with contemporary statesmen, 227—perplexed by the attitude of Mary in relation to her trial, 416—endeavours to persuade her to appear, but is defied by Mary, 417.

Chalmers, David, placarded as one of the murderers of Darnley, i. 273.

Chalmers, James, of Gadgirth, i. 17.

Chambers, Robert, his indication of the locality of Queen Mary's seizure by Bothwell, i. 307.

Charles IX. gives his consent to the Massacre of St Bartholomew, ii. 142—his death and remorse, 185.

Chateauneuf (de), M., French ambassador in London, his interview with Gilbert Gifford, ii. 335.

Chatelar, the poet, i. 70—found concealed in Queen Mary's bedchamber, and condemned to death, 95.

Chatelherault, entry of Queen Mary into, i. 33.

Chatelherault, Duke of, arrives in Scotland, i. 484—refuses to acknowledge the authority of the infant king, and is arrested, *ib.*—is liberated by Kirkaldy, ii. 7—flees to the Highlands, 13.

Chatsworth, interview between Cecil and Queen Mary at, ii. 20.

Chrichton, the Jesuit, story of the paper thrown into the sea by him, ii. 290—consequences of his capture, 291.

Clernault, French envoy in Edinburgh, his assertion that the house at Kirk-of-Field was mined, i. 248.

Clinton, Lord, one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, i. 427.

Cobham, Lord, a secret partisan of Queen Mary, ii. 55—a prisoner in the Tower, 83.

Cockburn of Ormiston, i. 29.

Cockburn, Sir James, Queen Mary's commissioner at the Conference at York, i. 401.

Coldingham, John Maitland, Abbot of, i. 262.

Coligni, Admiral, attempted assassination of, ii. 139—exults at the assassination of the Duke of Guise, i. 93.

Condé, Prince of, i. 38—rebellion of, 90—taken prisoner at Dreux, 92—his death at Jarnac, 488.

Confession of Faith adopted at the Convention of 1560, i. 53.

Congregation, Lords of the, i. 22—occupy Edinburgh, 26—attack Leith, 29—driven from Edinburgh, *ib.*—propose the marriage of the Earl of Arran with Queen Elizabeth, *ib.*—retire to Stirling, 30—seek the aid of the Queen of England, 31—conclude a treaty with Elizabeth at Berwick, 40—advised to accept the proposed peace, 43—their interview with the Queen-Regent in Edinburgh Castle, 48—entreat her to receive a visit from their favourite preacher Willock, *ib.*—send a special mission to Elizabeth proposing her marriage with the Earl of Arran, 56—exult over the death of

Francis II., 58—are really opposed to Queen Mary's return to Scotland, though sending her an invitation, 67.
Constable, Robert, is employed to entrap the Earl of Westmoreland, i. 505—witnesses the strong feeling of the country against giving up the fugitives, 507.
Convention of nobles at Perth, i. 108.
Convention of 1560 decided to be a legally constituted Parliament, i. 53—of 1561 approves of the Book of Discipline, 59.
Cotton Library, original despatch by the English commissioners to Elizabeth preserved in, i. 219—forged contract of marriage of Mary with Bothwell in, 283—copy of the bond subscribed at Aynslie's supper in, 302.
Council, Act of, accusing Queen Mary of murder, i. 378—signed by three of Bothwell's accomplices in the murder, 379—variances between the Act of Parliament and, 380—no copy of the Act of, accusing Mary of murder, to be found in the original records of Murray's Privy Council, 381.
Courcelles, Marie, assists Queen Mary's escape from Lochleven, i. 386.
Covenant, the, subscribed, i. 21.
Craig, Rev. John, refuses to proclaim the banns between Bothwell and Mary, i. 323.
Craigmillar Castle, i. 188, 243, 260.
Crawford, Thomas, his deposition of the interview between Darnley and Queen Mary at Glasgow, i. 184—his deposition produced, 199—is desired to search for more matters against Queen Mary, *ib.*—remarkable agreement of his deposition with the terms of the alleged letters of Mary to Bothwell, 196—light thrown on this subject by a correspondence preserved at Hamilton, 199—produces a paper at the Westminster Conference, giving an account of Queen Mary's conversation with Darnley at Glasgow, 452—probable time at which this conversation was committed to writing, 453—copy of his deposition, 579—volunteers to take Dumbarton Castle by surprise, ii. 89.
Croc (Du), the French ambassador, his letter written on the day Queen Mary visited Bothwell at Hermitage, i. 161—refuses to attend the marriage of Queen Mary with Bothwell, 328—attempts to mediate between the opposing forces at Carberry Hill, 335—his interview with Maitland, 344—writes the particulars of it to Catherine de Medici, 345—his statements contradict the accusations in the Book of Articles, 436.
Crossraguel Abbey, i. 85.
Cullen, Captain, advises the conspirators to strangle Darnley for surety, i. 269.
Cunningham, Robert, sent by Lennox to protest against the trial of Bothwell being proceeded with, i. 291, 297.

DACRE, Leonard, joins the party of Queen Mary, i. 497—resolves to strike a fresh blow for the Scottish queen, 515—is surprised and defeated by Lord Hunsdon, 516—devises a plan for Queen Mary's escape from England, ii. 2.
Dalgleish, George, a servant of Bothwell, i. 244—alleged discovery of a silver box on him containing letters of Queen Mary, 347—execution of, 383—statement in the Book of Articles regarding the finding of Queen Mary's alleged letters on, 445—his deposition produced at the Westminster Conference, 450.
Dalkeith, interview of the Earl of Morton with Killigrow at, ii. 148.
Darnley, Lord Henry, his first interview with Queen Mary, i. 101—is privately married to her, 103—his vices, 104—makes enemies of the Protestant chiefs, *ib.*—his insolence and imbecility, 122—his demand for the crown-matrimonial resisted by Mary on the advice of Riccio, 124—his bond with the rebel leaders to obtain the crown-matrimonial, 134—insists that Riccio should be murdered in presence of the queen, 137—his probable reasons for this, *ib.* — not really jealous of Riccio, 144—declares before the Privy Council that he had no participation in the plot to murder Riccio, 148—proofs of his complicity laid before the queen, 149—threatens to kill Murray, 154—opposes the pardon of the Earl of Morton, 156—expresses his determination to quit Scotland, 157—indifference during the queen's illness, 162—visits Queen Mary at Craigmillar, 163—proposal that he should be divorced, *ib.*—conspiracy against, 166—his inexplicable conduct, 167—is absent from the baptism of the young prince, 168—goes to Glasgow on the day of Morton's pardon, 169—is seized with smallpox, 178—Mary sends her own physician to him, *ib.*—ripening of the plot against, 179—is visited by Queen Mary at Glasgow, 184—is penitent and affectionate, and agrees to return to Craigmillar, 185—proofs

that it was he who first proposed reconciliation, and wrote to Mary to visit him, 186—arrives at Edinburgh with Mary, and is located at Kirk-of-Field, 214—quarrel between him and Lord Robert Stewart, 242—is visited by the queen on the night of his murder, 244 — depositions of the murderers taken before the Lords of Secret Council, 245—alleged removal of the bed at Kirk-of-Field, 258—his murder not a domestic but a political crime, 265—remarkable character of the history of the depositions and confessions regarding it, *ib.*—manner and circumstances of his death examined, 268—discovery of the body, *ib.*—belief at the time that he and his servant were strangled, *ib.*—testimony of Sir William Drury, 269—and of Count Moretta, *ib.*—reward offered for the discovery of his murderers, 273—evidence of two women living at Kirk-of-Field, *ib.*—rumours and suspicions after the murder, 277—funeral of, 278—feeling in Paris on receipt of the news of his murder, 286—four persons tried by the Secret Council for his murder, 354—Queen Mary accused in the Book of Articles of his murder, 439—and of the removal of his bed from Kirk-of-Field previous to the murder, 441 — and of playing pall-mall and golf at Seton a few days after, *ib.*—band for the murder destroyed by Maitland, ii. 212—Bothwell's account of the murder, 583.

Davison, William, sent by Elizabeth to Scotland to assist Bowes, ii. 256.

Deprivation, the Act of, proclaimed by the Lords of the Congregation, i. 27.

Discipline, the Book of, approved by the Convention of States, i. 59.

Douglas, Archibald, accompanies Bothwell and Maitland to Holyrood, i. 213 —attempt to arrest, 262 — confirms Morton's statement that the conspirators promised to obtain the queen's written consent, 263—his testimony as to the "band" for the murder of Darnley, *ib.*—detained in England, ii. 215—denounced as the forger of the letters produced to the Parliament by Randolph, 217—the probable forger of the alleged letters of Queen Mary to Bothwell, 218—engaged by Walsingham to intercept Queen Mary's correspondence, 290.

Douglas, George, uncle of Darnley, joins the conspiracy against Riccio, i. 131 —stabs Riccio in presence of the queen, 139—exempted from the pardon granted to the other murderers of Riccio, 169.

Douglas, George, assists Queen Mary's escape from Lochleven, i. 386.

Douglas, William, assists Queen Mary's escape from Lochleven, i. 386—is discharged from Queen Mary's service, ii. 73.

Douglases, their tombs destroyed by the English invaders, i. 15 — their tyranny, 6.

Drake, Sir Francis, his expeditions to Vigo and St Domingo, ii. 320.

Dreux, battle of, i. 91.

Drottningholm, memoir of Bothwell's affairs in 1568 preserved in the Royal Library at, ii. 576.

Drury, Sir William, implicates Ker of Faudonside in Darnley's murder, i. 246—his statement that the murderers resolved for surety to strangle Darnley, 269 — scandalous stories against Mary transmitted by him, 279 — his account of the scene at Bothwell's trial, 294 — his account of the queen's visit to Stirling, and allegation that she tried to poison her son, 306 — his scandal as to Mary's shooting at the butts at Seton with Bothwell, 441—leads an English force to Linlithgow, ii. 13 —sent to Edinburgh by Elizabeth to reconcile the rival factions, 93 —proceeds to the assistance of Morton in the reduction of Edinburgh Castle, 170.

Dudley, Lord Robert, recommended by Queen Elizabeth as a husband for Queen Mary, i. 98—having hopes of marrying Elizabeth, is averse to the proposal, 99.

Dumbarton Castle, held for Queen Mary by Lord Fleming, i. 376-384—surprised and captured by Thomas Crawford, ii. 90.

Dunbar burnt by Lord Grey, i. 14—flight of Queen Mary to, 143—castle of, 319—Mary accused in the Book of Articles of mocking her subjects at, 442—castle of, surrendered to Regent Murray, 376.

Dunfermline, Abbot of, attends the Conference at York, i. 401—sent as commissioner to London, ii. 35.

Durie, John, banished from Edinburgh for language abusive of Lennox and King James, ii. 245—returns to Edinburgh in triumph, 248.

EDINBURGH ordered by Henry VIII. to be burnt, i. 14—occupied by the Lords of the Congregation, 26—occupied by the troops of the Queen-Regent, 29—treaty of, 50—masque of Robin Hood and Little John performed at, 69—monks, priests, and filthy persons ordered to remove from,

79—street fight in, between the retainers of Sir John Gordon and Lord Ogilvie, 86—surprised and occupied by Kirkaldy of Grange, 113—arrival of Mary and Darnley at, 241—state of, on the day of Bothwell's trial, 294—the insurgent nobles determine to take possession of, 334.

Edinburgh Castle, the Queen-Regent retires to, i. 41—Queen Mary's confinement in, 149, 152, 154—surrendered to Regent Murray, 376.

Edmonston, James, tried for the murder of Darnley, i. 354.

Edward VI., project of his marriage with Mary Queen of Scots revived, i. 16—premature death of, *ib.*

Eglinton, Earl of, taken by the English squadron, i. 68—slips away from Bothwell's entertainment without signing the bond, 301, 302.

Elbeuf (d'), Marquis, accompanies Queen Mary to Scotland, i. 70.

Elizabeth, Queen of England, i. 19—has an interview with the Earl of Arran, 28—her marriage with the Earl of Arran proposed by the Lords of the Congregation, *ib.*—sends money to the Lords of the Congregation, *ib.*—is asked for active aid, 31—consents to send a fleet to Scotland, 32—her foreign policy, 34—writes to Mary of Lorraine disclaiming hostile intentions, *ib.*—her policy in France, 30, 37—concludes a treaty with the Lords of the Congregation for the expulsion of the French from Scotland, and assures the Queen-Regent that this is meant for peace, 40—sends an army into Scotland under Lord Grey, 41—begins to waver in the prosecution of the war, 42—sends Cecil to Scotland, 47—Scottish deputation to, proposing her marriage with the Earl of Arran, 57—declares that she is content with her maiden state, *ib.*—is offended that the offer is not renewed, *ib.*—rejects Queen Mary's application for a safe-conduct, 65—rejects the proposal that Mary should be declared heir to the crown of England, 76—makes a treaty with the Huguenot leaders in France, 91—declines a meeting with Mary at York, 97—recommends Lord Dudley as a husband for Mary, 98—writes to Mary to allow the Earl of Lennox to return to Scotland, 99—changes her mind, and asks Mary to revoke her consent, 100—her dissimulation, 101—declares against Mary's marriage with Darnley, 102—imprisons the Countess of Lennox, *ib.*—promises assistance to Murray in his rebellion, 110—her uneasiness as to events in Scotland, 116—authorises the Earl of Bedford to furnish Murray with arms and money, 117—orders the Catholic earls of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland to London, *ib.*—requires Mary to send her husband back to England, 118—forbids the Earl of Murray to come to her Court, 119—is charged by the French and Spanish ambassadors with stirring up dissensions in Scotland, *ib.*—denies the charge, and is exonerated by Murray, 120—her meanness and falsehood, *ib.*—seems to have known and approved of the conspiracy for the murder of Riccio, and other designs against Queen Mary, 133, 136—consents to stand godmother to Mary's son, 153—takes credit for obtaining the pardon of Morton, 169—declines to make any settlement of the succession to the crown, 174—commissions Bedford to obtain confirmation of the treaty of Edinburgh, *ib.*—rumour attributes the plot against Darnley to her, 277—writes to Mary in behalf of Lennox, 294—refuses to aid the confederacy against Bothwell, 327—reproves the tone of Kirkaldy's letters with reference to Mary, *ib.*—refuses to aid the insurgent nobles, 344—her indignation at the harsh treatment of the Queen of Scots, 355—perplexity of her ministers on this account, 356—her sincerity not credited, 357—Maitland's opinion of her conduct, *ib.*—the opinion of the King of France, *ib.*—she sends loving messages to Mary at Lochleven, *ib.*—her message to Mary by Nicholas Elphinstone, 359—declares her desire to obtain liberty for Mary, punishment of the king's murderers, and the safety of the young prince, 360—the imputations cast on her for her proposal that the young prince should be sent to England appear to be groundless, *ib.*—declares that she will avenge Mary if she is deprived of her royal estate, 363—her indignation at the refusal of the insurgent lords to allow her ambassador to see Queen Mary in Lochleven, *ib.*—feels that the world will now give her no credit for sincerity, 364—takes Cecil to task for having done nothing to liberate Mary, *ib.*—purchases part of Queen Mary's jewels from Regent Murray, 384—her first impulse to give the fugitive Queen (Mary) a warm welcome, 391—the majority of her Council opposed to this, *ib.*—allows her first inclinations to be overruled, 393—advice of Scrope and Knollys to, 399—informed of Murray's clandestine proceedings at the Conference, 411—proposes to

remove the Conference to London, 412 — her future proceedings against Queen Mary are explained by the letter of the Earl of Sussex, 317—her ancient enmity against Mary revived by the project of her marriage to the Duke of Norfolk, 419—gives an evasive answer to Mary's demand to be permitted to appear in person at the Conference, and dissembles and equivocates to the last, 425—found by the six earls to be justified in refusing to receive the Queen of Scots in person as her case now stood, 458—has an interview with the Bishop of Ross, 459—writes to Cecil requesting him to suggest to Mary, as from himself, that it would be the wisest course to resign her crown, 462—writes a letter to Mary in furtherance of Cecil's scheme to entrap her into a resignation, 463—makes a last attempt to effect a compromise by suggesting that Mary should resign her crown, 471—seems touched by the appeal of the French ambassador in Mary's behalf, 478—but flies into a passion at her next interview with him, 479—her fury at the discovery of the coalition for the marriage of Mary with the Duke of Norfolk and her restoration to the throne, 496—orders that Mary should be immediately put to death in the event of any rising of Norfolk's adherents, *ib.*—her severity to the Catholic rebels, 503—causes three hundred executions in the county of Durham alone, 504—remonstrances of the High Sheriff of Yorkshire and Bishop of Durham to, *ib.*—wishes to obtain possession of the leaders of the rebellion cheaply, 506—sends an expedition into Scotland in revenge for Westmoreland's raid, ii. 8—disclaims hostile intentions against the people of Scotland, 9—advised by her ministers to declare openly for the party of the young King James, 11—her excitement and irritation at the appearance of Leslie's 'Defence of Queen Mary's Honour,' 12—is declared by Pope Pius V. an excommunicated heretic, *ib.*—executes Felton for fixing the Pope's bull to the house of the Bishop of London, 13—her conduct towards Scotland after the death of Regent Murray, 16—is flattered by the proposals of the Duke of Anjou for her hand, 17—sincerely anxious at this time to get rid of Queen Mary, 19—no foundation for the Catholic scandals against her reputation, 23—delays the ratification of the articles for Queen Mary's restoration, 28—spends the winter coquetting with the Duke of Anjou, 30—sends two physicians to attend Mary in her illness, 33—dissatisfied with the doctrine of the Scottish commissioners that the people had an inherent right to depose their sovereigns, 35—regards Morton's reply to her demand for their reasons for proceeding against Queen Mary as a threat, 36—her fury at hearing of the alleged project of the marriage of Mary to the Duke of Anjou, 38—begins to suspect the truth of the story of the projected marriage of Queen Mary to the Duke of Anjou, *ib.*—apparently makes up her mind to the fulfilment of the treaty of Chatsworth, 39—the negotiations broken off, 40—receives from Morton a mutilated copy of a letter from Denmark addressed to Lennox, 41—confiscates half a million of ducats sent by Philip of Spain to the Duke of Alva, 44—her murder represented by Ridolphi as part of his plot, 54—the motives which influenced her in her treatment of Queen Mary, 75—taunts Queen Mary with the cost of her maintenance, 77—refuses to carry out the sentence against Norfolk, 115—at last consents, 116—rejects a bill of attainder passed by both Houses against Mary, 118—her petty annoyances of Mary, 121—treaty of Blois with Charles IX., 135—consents to send a force to assist Morton in the reduction of Edinburgh Castle, 169—orders Sir William Drury to deliver up to the regent Kirkaldy of Grange, Maitland, and other prisoners taken in Edinburgh Castle, 172—refuses Queen Mary's request for the services of a priest, 177—her notions of religious toleration, *ib.*—revives the atrocious scheme of surrendering Mary to the regent for execution in Scotland, 183—her conduct in accepting Queen Mary's presents while she was haggling with Morton for the price of her blood, 185—sanctions a plot for the assassination of Aubigny, Earl of Lennox, and imprisonment of the young king, 209—determines to save Morton at all risks, and moves a force to the Borders, 215—hostility manifested against her by the Catholic Powers, 226—her vacillation and indecision, 222—persecution of the Catholics under, 223, 241—her proposed marriage with the Duke of Alençon, 229—receives a long letter from Queen Mary, 250—sends Beale to Sheffield to renew the negotiations for her liberation, 253—approves of Mary's proposals, *ib.*—attitude of her ministers towards

Queen Mary's liberation, 255—persecution of the English Catholics under, 265—consents to treat with the Earl of Arran, 274—demands that Arran and Fernihirst be sent to Carlisle for trial for the death of Lord Russell, 310—succeeds in concluding a league with James to the exclusion of his mother, 315—asks James to restore to favour Archibald Douglas, one of his father's murderers, 316—importance of the close alliance with Scotland at this time, *ib.*—intervention in the Netherlands, 317—her rage at Leicester's assumption of the title of Governor-General in the Netherlands, 321—proposes to abandon her Protestant allies to Philip's honour and conscience, 322—allows the English soldiers in Holland to starve, 323—her excitement and alarm during the investigations into the Babington conspiracy, 394—her desire to devise a more horrible death for the conspirators than that prescribed by law for treason, 396—issues a Royal Commission for the trial of Queen Mary, 412—sends a letter to Queen Mary informing her of this, 415—her reply to the address of the Houses of Parliament, recommending the execution of Queen Mary, 432 — her second reply, 434 — consents that Queen Mary should be put to death privately, 451—signs the death-warrant, 453—hints to Davison her desire that Mary's keepers should put her to death without legal warrant, 454—writes reproachfully to Sir Amias Paulet that he has not found out some way of shortening Queen Mary's life, 455—her rage at Sir Amias Paulet's refusal to assassinate his prisoner, 456—receives the news of Queen Mary's death, 470 — pretends that the execution had taken place against her express orders, 471—vents her displeasure on Davison, *ib.*—tries to conciliate King James, 473—describes his mother's death as a miserable accident, 474 — her difficulties with France and Spain arising out of Mary's death, 477 — prepares to resist the Spanish invasion, 481—goes to Tilbury to review her troops, 484 — her character and reputation, 486.

Elliot, John, of Park, slain by Bothwell, i. 158.

Elphinstone, Nicolas, an emissary of Murray, i. 216 — has an interview with Elizabeth on his way to Scotland, 359—sent to London by Murray to sell Queen Mary's jewels, 384—sent by Murray to London to obtain from Elizabeth the surrender of Queen Mary, 510—employed by Killigrow to sound the regent, ii. 148.

England, alliance between the French and Scots against, i. 24.

Englefield, Sir Francis, letter from, to the Duchess of Feria, ii. 3.

Errington, Nicolas, private instructions given by Queen Elizabeth to, ii. 560.

Erskine, Lord, Governor of Edinburgh Castle, i. 41.

Espes (d'), Don Gueraldo, the Spanish ambassador, implicated in the Ridolphi plot, ii. 86—denounces Lord Burghley as the real disturber of the public peace, 87—is sent out of England, 88.

Essex, Earl of, one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, i. 427.

Farnese, Alexander, Prince of Parma, his victories in the Netherlands, ii. 317 — proposed marriage of Queen Mary to, 330 — his scheme for the invasion of England, 331.

Fénelon, La Mothe, the French ambassador at the English Court, appeals to Elizabeth in Mary's behalf, i. 478—describes the alleged secret project of a marriage of the Duke of Anjou to Queen Mary as a trick of Elizabeth's ministers, ii. 38—applies to Elizabeth without success for the suppression of Buchanan's 'Detection,' 81—recall of, 185—sent to Edinburgh, 256.

Feria, Duchess of, curious letter to, from Sir Francis Englefield, ii. 3.

Feria, Duke of, intrusts Fitzwilliam, Sir John Hawkins' messenger, with letters for Queen Mary, ii. 59.

Fernihirst, Laird of, receives the fugitive Earl of Westmoreland, i. 502—refuses to give him up to Murray, 503—made chief magistrate of Edinburgh, ii. 93.

Fitzwilliam, Sir John Hawkins' messenger, having received letters from the Duke of Feria, obtains an interview with Queen Mary, ii. 60—receives a letter from Queen Mary to Philip of Spain, 61—ascertains Philip's plans, and completes an agreement to furnish a naval force, 62.

Fleming, Lady, captured in Dumbarton Castle by Thomas Crawford, ii. 91.

Fleming, Lord, holds Dumbarton Castle for Queen Mary, i. 376—accompanies Queen Mary into England, 390—holds Dumbarton Castle for Queen Mary, ii. 89.

Fletcher, Dr, Dean of Peterborough, insults Queen Mary at her last devotions, ii. 466.

Foix (de), Paul, French ambassador in London, i. 116—his letter to Cecil, from which it appears that Cecil had

told him that Riccio was killed in the act of adultery with Queen Mary, ii. 78.
Foster, Sir John, letter by, concerning the trial of Morton for the murder of Darnley, i. 261—letter from, 291—quarrel between his followers and those of Ker of Fernihirst, 309—invades the eastern Border, ii. 11.
Fotheringay, trial of Queen Mary at, ii. 420.
Foulbriggs, the locality of Queen Mary's seizure by Bothwell, i. 307.
Foulden Kirk, interview between the Earl of Arran and Lord Hunsdon at, ii. 275.
Fountainbridge, near Edinburgh, i. 307.
France, alliance of, with Scotland, i. 15—treaty of marriage between Mary and the Dauphin of, *ib.*—union of the crowns of Scotland and, 24.
Francis, Duke of Guise, i. 19.
Francis II. married to Queen Mary, i. 19—succeeds to the throne of France, 24—Mary takes precedence of, 33—pardons the conspirators of Amboise, 38—refuses to ratify the treaty of Edinburgh, 53—his death, 58.
Fraser, Mynart, tried for the murder of Darnley, i. 354.
Frenchmen appointed to important offices of State in Scotland, i. 17, 25.
Froude, Mr, his assertion that Mary signed the Catholic League, i. 126—that Mary was preparing to stir up a rebellion in Ireland, 153—the source of his notions of the character and conduct of Mary, 172—on De Silva's account of the alleged letter of Queen Mary implicating her in her husband's murder, 216—adopts as genuine the incredible narrative of Paris, 257—his statement that the general instinct settled upon the queen as the murderess of Darnley, 275—that forty days should have been allowed to Bothwell after his citation, 289—that Lennox was forbidden to bring more than six attendants to Bothwell's trial, 291—his addition to Drury's accounts of two incidents reflecting strongly on Queen Mary, 295—his denial that Morton was a party to the bond subscribed at Aynslie's supper, 304—Drury's evidence on the subject, *ib.*—Morton's own evidence, *ib.*—his statement as to Queen Mary's seizure by Bothwell, 307—that not a single nobleman attended Queen Mary's marriage with Bothwell, 328—assigns as the reason for the silence of the Confederate Lords as to the alleged discovery of the queen's letters that the silver casket contained the bond for Darnley's murder, 351—his statement that the insurgent lords sent in haste to Paris for Murray on the occasion of the alleged discovery of the queen's letters, 352—his description of Murray's conduct in France, 372—his statement that the peasants cut at Queen Mary with their reaping-hooks as she struggled along the by-lanes after Langside, 389—he alone regards the Regent Murray with unmixed admiration, 439—his statement as to the Regent Murray's good faith in regard to the Duke of Norfolk, 499—his remarks on the Anjou marriage wholly inexplicable, ii. 38—his statement as to Queen Mary's feigned sickness on the occasion of Beale's visit, 235—his extraordinary mistakes regarding Beale's negotiations with Mary at Sheffield Castle, 258—his assertion that Mary wrote letters to the Duke of Guise urging him to action, 263—misquotes Queen Mary's words, and misleads his readers, 288—his attempted explanation of the postscript added to Mary's letter to Babington, 369—his misstatements as to the documents relative to Mary's complicity with Babington, 390—his confusion of ideas regarding the character of Queen Mary, 492—his fictions, 493.
Gifford, Gilbert, a spy of Walsingham's, the real author of the Babington conspiracy, ii. 334, 340—his connection with the "honest man," 336—obtains possession of Queen Mary's correspondence, 337—his relations with Babington, 340—applies to Walsingham for instructions and advice, 356—afraid lest his treachery should be discovered, 375—his letter to Philipps, 376—his undisguised discourse to Philipps of forgery, 378—afraid lest he should be brought face to face with Queen Mary, 379—his death, 407—his letter to Walsingham touching the "practising in hand" with Queen Mary's letters, 602.
Glencairn, Earl of, i. 56—joins the insurgents, 112—signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, 342—breaks into and destroys the queen's chapel at Holyrood, 354.
Gogar Burn, i. 307.
Goodall, Mr, proves that the Glasgow letters were originally written in Scotch, i. 220, 235.
Gordon, Sir John, strife between his retainers and those of Lord Ogilvie, i. 86—imprisoned and escapes, 87—ordered to repair to Stirling, *ib.*—escapes from his guards, *ib.*—is executed at Aberdeen, *ib.*

Gordon, Lady Jane, married to Bothwell, i. 148—her divorce from Bothwell, 284—dispensation for the marriage of Bothwell with her concealed from Queen Mary, ii. 52.
Gordon, Sir Adam, his successes in the North, ii. 94.
Gowrie, Earl of—*see* Ruthven, Lord.
Graham, Lord, signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, i. 342.
Grange—*see* Kirkaldy.
Gray, the Master of, arrives in Scotland, ii. 276—prepared to betray Queen Mary, 278—his treachery, 294—success of his mission to England, 307—plans the murder of Arran, 309—resolves to proceed with the murder of Arran, 311—recommends that Queen Mary should be poisoned, 448—is commissioned by King James to negotiate with Elizabeth, *ib.*—manner in which he fulfilled his commission, 450—brought to trial, 475.
Grey, Lord, reports that he has burnt Musselburgh and Dunbar, i. 14, n.—leads an English army into Scotland, 41—besieges Leith, 42—his unsuccessful assault on Leith, 44—burns the letter of the Queen-Regent applying for a physician, 45.
Guise, Francis, Duke of, his defence of Metz and capture of Calais, i. 19—his influence over Queen Mary, 24—defeats the conspiracy of Amboise, 38—captures Rouen, 91—victorious at Dreux, 92—invests Orleans, 93—his assassination, *ib.*—proposed invasion of England for the liberation of Queen Mary by, ii. 238—projected invasion of England by, frustrated, 262—approves of the project to re-establish the Catholic religion in Scotland, 409.

Hailes, Lord, his remarks on Queen Mary's marriage with Bothwell, i. 322.
Hall, John, captured in Dumbarton Castle, and delivered up to the English, ii. 91.
Hamilton, list of nobles assembled at, in the interest of the queen, i. 353—Queen Mary takes the field at, 387.
Hamilton, John, Archbishop of St Andrews, i. 22—proceedings against, for celebrating mass, 96—implicated in the charge of Darnley's murder, 265—Buchanan's statements in reference to him, 266—encourages the marriage of Bothwell with the queen, 321—his alleged motive, 367—groundlessness of the charge that he advised that Mary should be put to death, *ib.*—captured by Crawford in Dumbarton Castle, ii. 91—accused of Darnley's murder and the murder of Regent Murray, 92—his character recklessly assailed by modern historians, *ib.*—is hanged by the Regent Lennox, 93.
Hamilton, Gavin, Abbot of Kilwinning, i. 119.
Hamilton, Sir James, i. 191, 195.
Hamilton, Lord John, joins Queen Mary at Carberry Hill, i. 337.
Hamlet, parallel between Mary Stewart and Gertrude, the mother of, i. 329.
Hampton Court, Council held at, i. 419—proceedings at, in the trial of Queen Mary, 455—result of the deliberations there, 458—meetings at, 455, 473, 475, 476—Mary's commissioners summoned to, 472.
Hatton, Sir Christopher, persuades Queen Mary to appear for trial under protest, ii. 419.
Hawkins, Sir John, his expedition to the Mexican coast, ii. 57—offers to assist the King of Spain against Elizabeth if his imprisoned comrades are released, 58—succeeds in deceiving Philip, 61—his real intention to destroy the Spanish fleet, 62—Cecil is an accomplice in his designs, 63—Elizabeth privy to the whole transactions, 63.
Hay, Alexander, notary, his double fraud in connection with the depositions of French Paris, i. 256.
Hay, John, of Talla, concerned in the blowing up of the house at Kirk-of-Field, i. 245—accuses Huntly and Bothwell of the murder of Darnley, *ib.*—his description of the placing of the powder in the house at Kirk-of-Field, 247—apprehended for complicity in Darnley's murder, 376—accuses various persons, friends and supporters of Regent Murray, 377—these charges suppressed in his published confession, *ib.*—execution of, 383—confession and declaration of, *ib.*—his deposition produced at the Westminster Conference, 450.
Henry II. of France, his religious persecutions, i. 14—makes the Earl of Arran Duke of Chatelherault, 16—killed, 24—his death a misfortune to the Scottish Reformers, *ib.*
Henry VIII., plunder of the monasteries under, i. 6—character of, 7—invites James V. to meet him at York, *ib.*—declares war against Scotland, 8—desires to annex Scotland, 10—seizes Scottish merchant ships, 11—approves of the murder of Cardinal Beaton, and rewards the murderers, 13—savage orders of, to his generals invading Scotland, 14—his religious persecutions, *ib.*
Hepburn, John, of Bolton, concerned in

the blowing up of the house at Kirk-of-Field, i. 245—his description of the placing of the powder in the house at Kirk-of-Field, 247 — declares on the scaffold that Maitland, Huntly, and Argyll had signed the bond for Darnley's murder, 383—his deposition produced at the Westminster Conference, 450.
Hermitage, visit of Queen Mary to, i. 438.
Hermitage, castle of, i. 83, 158.
Herries, Lord, the story of his imploring Queen Mary not to marry Bothwell, i. 324—comes with reinforcements to Queen Mary at Carberry Hill, 337—his statement that the bond for Darnley's murder was found in Bothwell's repositories, 351—accompanies Queen Mary to England, 390—arrives in London as the representative of Queen Mary, 395—entertains no doubt of Elizabeth's friendly intentions, 396—arrested by Regent Murray, 484—liberated by Kirkaldy, ii. 7.
Hiegate, Will, Town-Clerk of Glasgow, i. 181, 192, 195.
Higford, a retainer of the Duke of Norfolk, arrested, and produces the letter sent by Queen Mary to his master, ii. 64.
Hogg, Christina, her marriage with Sebastian Paiges, i. 244.
Holyrood, Queen Mary at, i. 213, 241—masked ball at, on the night of Darnley's murder, 244—Queen Mary at, after her marriage with Bothwell, 333—the queen's chapel at, destroyed, 354.
Houston, castle of, i. 287.
Hubert, Nicolas, a servant of Queen Mary, commonly called French Paris, i. 191, 211, 212.
Huguenots, conspiracy of, at Amboise, i. 34, 38—rebellion in France, 91—defeated at Jarnac, 487—rebellion drawing to a close, 500—privateers drive Spanish vessels into Southampton, ii. 43—influence increasing, 135.
Hume, David, his explanation of the variance between the descriptions of the alleged letters of Mary given by the Act of Council and the Act of Parliament, i. 380 — his statement that Mary only charged Morton and Maitland with the murder of her husband by way of recrimination, 399—his narrative of the proceedings at the Conference at Westminster, 431—designates the objection to the form of protest of Mary's commissioners a judicious artifice, 451 — his statement as to the regularity of Norfolk's trial, ii. 114—his estimate of the character of Queen Mary, 491.
Hume, Lord, appears at Borthwick with an army, i. 333—signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, 342.
Hunsdon, Lord, advises the removal of Queen Mary from Tutbury, i. 501—surprises and defeats Leonard Dacre, 516—refuses to convey the Earl of Northumberland to execution, ii. 130.
Huntly, Earl of, leader of the Catholic party, i. 85—takes arms to seize the queen at Aberdeen, 87—is defeated and slain, *ib.*—his house at Strathbogie plundered, 88.
Huntly, Earl of, accused by John Hay of complicity in Darnley's murder, i. 245—is one of the Lords of Secret Council before whom the depositions of Darnley's murderers were taken, *ib.*—is implicated in the murder of Darnley by Ormiston, 260—hastens to join Queen Mary at Carberry Hill, 337—meets with Argyll and other nobles in the queen's interest at Hamilton, 350—his energy in the queen's interest, 368—takes arms for the queen, 485—protestation of, regarding Darnley's murder, 569.

James IV. the most vigorous monarch of the house of Stewart, i. 331.
James V., character of, i. 5—confidence in the clergy, 6—resolution to invade England opposed by the nobles, 8—invades Cumberland, *ib.* — dies of grief, 9.
James VI. crowned at Stirling, i. 366—list of nobles present at or absent from his coronation, *ib.*—arrests Morton for the murder of Darnley, ii. 214 — prepares for threatened war with England on Morton's account, 215 — his character, 234 — is made prisoner in Ruthven Castle by the Earl of Gowrie, 246 — French envoys sent to Scotland in consequence of his captivity, 256—escapes, 258—a new conspiracy against, 261 — is in correspondence with the Duke of Guise, *ib.*—abandons his mother, 305—his devotion to the chase, 308—captured in Stirling by the Earl of Angus, 313 — concludes a league with Elizabeth to the exclusion of his mother, 315—Mary proposes to send him to Spain to be instructed and reduced to the Catholic religion, 333—his opposition to his mother's trial attempted to be overcome by a singular device, 414—agrees to accept a fresh pension from Elizabeth and an English duchy as compensation for his mother's death, 477.
Johnson, Dr Samuel, his expression of the injustice of Queen Mary's captivity and death, ii. 489.

KENNEDY, Jane, assists Queen Mary's escape from Lochleven, i. 386.
Kent, Earl of, his behaviour to Queen Mary at her execution, ii. 460, 464.
Ker of Faudonside presents a pistol at Queen Mary, i. 139—exempted from the pardon granted to the murderers of Riccio, 169—seen in Edinburgh on the night of Darnley's murder, 246—marries the widow of John Knox, ii. 164.
Ker of Fernihirst, quarrel between his followers and those of Sir John Foster, ii. 309.
Killigrew, Henry, arrives in Scotland and is received by Queen Mary, i. 284—his letter to Cecil, 285—despatched to Scotland by Cecil to propose the delivery of Queen Mary to the regent, ii. 146—is assured by Morton that she should be put to death within three hours of her arrival, 149—urges Lord Burghley to send a force for the capture of Edinburgh Castle, 168—is sent a second time to Scotland to negotiate for the surrender of Mary, 184—letters of, to the English ministers regarding the proposed surrender of Queen Mary, 565.
Kilwinning, Abbot of, his alleged proposal to put Queen Mary to death, i. 367—Queen Mary's commissioner at the Conference at York, 401.
Kirk-of-Field, i. 189, 215.
Kirkaldy of Grange joins the insurgents, i. 113—surprises and occupies Edinburgh, *ib.*—returns to Edinburgh, 141—a strange mixture of fanaticism and chivalry, 305—had been concerned in the murder of Cardinal Beaton, *ib.*—not present" at Aynslie's supper, *ib.*—writes to Bedford that Mary would go to the world's end with Bothwell in a white petticoat, *ib.*—writes to Bedford of the objects and doings of the Confederate Lords, and asks the aid of Elizabeth for suppressing Bothwell, 326—agrees on behalf of the insurgent lords to the terms made by Mary at Carberry, 337—conducts Mary to the insurgent camp, 338—indignant at the violation of the terms of the queen's surrender, 340—commission to apprehend Bothwell issued to, 369—wrecked in Bressay Sound, 371—rescues Maitland when arrested by the regent, and joins the party of the queen, 494—visited by Murray in the Castle of Edinburgh, *ib.*—holds Edinburgh Castle for Queen Mary, ii. 14—deposes the magistrates of Edinburgh, 93—seizes the Regent Lennox and his party at Stirling, 95—is denounced as a murderer and cutthroat by John Knox, 154—complains to the kirk-session, 155—declines to treat with Regent Morton for the surrender of Edinburgh Castle, 165—his defence of Edinburgh Castle against Morton and Drury, 170—surrenders to Sir William Drury, 171—hanged at the Cross of Edinburgh, 172—his character, 174—Bothwell's account of his pursuit and capture by, 592.
Kirkaldy, Sir James, arrives at Blackness with money and stores for the garrison of Edinburgh Castle, ii. 167—his wife betrays the secret to Regent Morton, *ib.*—hanged at the Cross of Edinburgh along with his brother of Grange, 172.
Knollys, Sir Francis, his interview with Queen Mary, i. 398—manner in which he performed his ignoble task, 464—employed by Cecil to induce Queen Mary to resign her crown, 462.
Knox, John, at Geneva, i. 21—intention of him and his friends to establish their religion by force, 22—returns to Scotland, *ib.*—preaches at Perth, 23—proceeds through Fife, Stirling, and the Lothians, *ib.*—compared with Attila, *ib.*—prepares his hearers for the conflict, 26—declares the Queen-Regent may be lawfully deposed, 27—his slanders on the character of the Queen-Regent, 49—attempts to obtain a settled provision for the Reformed clergy, 59—his scheme for establishing parish schools, *ib.*—his hatred of his religious rivals, 60—his first interview with Queen Mary, 72—his boasting and exaggerations, *ib.* n.—his personal hostility to Queen Mary, 75—attributes the late and scanty harvest in Aberdeenshire and the north to the presence of the queen, 88—denounces the deadly sin of dancing, 90—his sensibility to female attractions, *ib.*—declares that the Almighty had guided the aim of the assassin of the Duke of Guise, 93—asserts that private individuals might slay idolaters and enemies of the true religion, 97—implicated by Randolph in the conspiracy against Riccio, 145—copies Buchanan's fictions, 172—returns to Edinburgh from the west, where he had been since Riccio's murder, 353—fails to induce Argyll and his associates to join the Confederate Lords, 354—violent denunciations of Mary, 362—addresses a remarkable letter to Cecil advising him to strike at the root, 508—acts in concert with the regent in endeavouring to persuade Elizabeth to surrender Queen Mary, 511—his prayers against the queen, *ib.*—his influence after the death of the Regent Murray, ii. 6—alone opposed to the

return of Queen Mary to Scotland, 16—his denunciations of the Massacre of St Bartholomew, 146—evidence of his complicity in Burghley's plot for the execution of Queen Mary in Scotland all but conclusive, 153—Killigrew has an interview with him, *ib.*—denounces Kirkaldy as a murderer and cut-throat, 154 — qualifies his charge on Kirkaldy's complaining to the kirk-session, 155—his connection with the events of the time, 156—denounces Maitland as an atheist, 154—his reply to Maitland's complaint to the kirk-session, 157—his death, 162—his character, 163—Killigrew's account of his preaching, 566.

LAING, Malcolm, on the Glasgow letters attributed to Queen Mary, i. 196, 200, 210, 211, 212, 214, 219, 221, 231, 236—his attempt to maintain the credit of French Paris, 255—admits that the so-called contract of marriage of Mary with Bothwell in the Cotton Library is not the original, 283—his reason for the silence of the Confederate Lords regarding the discovery of the alleged letters of Queen Mary to Bothwell, 350—his assertion that the disappearance of the alleged letters of Queen Mary demonstrates that they were genuine, 475—expresses himself with extreme confidence throughout his History respecting the authenticity of the queen's letters, but differently in private, *ib.*

Langside, battle of, i. 189, 199, 389.

Leicester, Earl of, one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, i. 427—proposes the restoration of Mary to her throne, and the fulfilment of the project of her marriage with the Duke of Norfolk, 489—uses his influence in favour of Queen Mary, ii. 119—his probable motives, 120—assumes the title of Governor-General in the Netherlands, 321.

Leith ordered by Henry VIII. to be sacked, and its inhabitants put to the sword without exception, i. 14, n.—occupied by the adherents of Mary of Lorraine, 26—attacked by the Lords of the Congregation, 29—sally by the garrison of, 42—siege of, by the united forces of Lord Grey and the leaders of the Congregation, *ib.*—assault of, repulsed, 44.

Lennox, Countess of, proposal that the young Prince James should be sent to England to, i. 360.

Lennox, Earl of, his refusal to meet Queen Mary on her way to Glasgow, i. 183, 185, 190—at Chiswick, 199—his correspondence with the queen after his son's murder, 287—asks Queen Mary to cause those whose names were placarded on the Tolbooth to be apprehended, 288 — furnishes the queen with a list of those whom he suspects, *ib.*—collects a host of armed retainers to attend Bothwell's trial, 290—sends word that he is sick, and asks postponement of the trial, 291—asks the queen to grant him her commission to apprehend those whom he suspected, *ib.*—writes to Queen Elizabeth to interfere in his behalf, 293—appears at the Conference, charging Queen Mary with his son's murder, 427—requests orders from Cecil for the reduction of Dumbarton Castle, ii. 14—is elected regent by the king's faction, *ib.* — marches against the queen's forces, 16—hangs thirty-four men of the garrison of Brechin Castle, *ib.*—sends Pitcairn, Abbot of Dunfermline, to London, to protest against Queen Mary's restoration, 29—despatches Thomas Buchanan to Denmark to negotiate for the surrender of Bothwell, 41—marches on Edinburgh, 93—is seized by Kirkaldy at Stirling, 95—is rescued by the Earl of Mar, but is wounded and dies, 96.

Lennox, Aubigny, Earl of, plot for the assassination of, ii. 209.

Lennox, Lord Henry, his marriage to Elizabeth Cavendish, ii. 283.

Lepanto, victory of Don John of Austria over the Turks at, ii. 86.

Leslie, John, Bishop of Ross, sent to France to invite Queen Mary to Scotland, i. 61—his statement that Mary visited Darnley at Glasgow at his own request, 186—his assertion that Murray communicated the intended murder of Darnley to his servant, 244—Queen Mary's commissioner at the Conference at York, 401—has an interview with Elizabeth, and recommends that Mary should either be allowed to return to Scotland or to proceed to France, 459—his part in the scheme contrived by Cecil to entrap Queen Mary into resignation of her crown, 462, 463—how his conduct is to be accounted for, 469—has an interview with Elizabeth, 470—informs her that Mary will listen to no proposal involving resignation of her crown, 471—arrested in London, 496—allowed to visit Queen Mary in her illness, ii. 33—is directed by Mary to inform Elizabeth that she intends to invoke the aid of foreign princes if the treaty of Chatsworth remains unfulfilled, *ib.*—letter of instructions from Queen Mary to Ridolphi drawn up by, 50—dexterously abstracts the

important letters from Bailly's packet, 55—suggests to the Duke of Norfolk the forcible dissolution of both Houses of the Legislature, 64—his Defence remains unanswered by Buchanan, 82—a prisoner in the Tower, 83—threatened with torture if he did not confess, 84—appeals to Elizabeth, 86—assured that his testimony would not be produced against Mary, *ib.*—his deposition produced against Norfolk, 102—letter by, to Archbishop Beaton, 502.

Letters, the alleged, of Queen Mary to Bothwell, i. 188, 190, 221, 226, 230, 309, 311, 313, 341—of Archibald Douglas, extracts from, 262—of Sir William Drury, false intelligence in, 279—of Kirkaldy of Grange, extract from, 305—remarkable, of John Knox, extract from, 508—of the Earl of Sussex to Cecil, 518—of instructions to Ridolphi, purport and authorship of, ii. 50—of Queen Mary to Ridolphi, extract from, 51—of Queen Mary to her servants, 72—of De Foix to Cecil, showing that Cecil had informed him that Riccio had been killed by Darnley in the act of adultery with Queen Mary, 79—of Queen Mary to the Duke of Norfolk, 105—of the Earl of Sussex to Randolph in behalf of Maitland, 161—of Fénelon, extract from, regarding the dissolute life of Regent Morton, 200—of Walsingham to Bowes, sanctioning in the queen's name a plot for the assassination of Lennox, 209—of Bowes to Walsingham, stating that Archibald Douglas had forged letters to effect the ruin of Lennox, 218—of Queen Mary to Elizabeth, 250—Dr Parry to Queen Elizabeth, 300—of Queen Mary to Parsons, 332—of Queen Mary to Charles Paget, 333—of Morgan to Queen Mary, 344—of Mary to Babington, 346—of Babington to Queen Mary, 348—of (alleged) Mary to Babington, 359—of Philipps to Walsingham, 371—of Gifford to Philipps, 376—of Cecil to Sir Christopher Hatton, 396—of Elizabeth to Mary, 415—of Mary (Queen) to Elizabeth, 435—of Mary to the Duke of Guise, 437—of Gray (the Master of) to Archibald Douglas, 449—of Elizabeth (Queen) to Sir Amias Paulet, reproaching him for not having put Mary to death without warrant, 455—of Norfolk (Duke of) to Queen Elizabeth, with an abstract of matters against the Queen of Scots, 497—of John Leslie, Bishop of Ross, to Archbishop Beaton, 504—of Maitland of Lethington to Archbishop Beaton, 510—of Secretary Raulet to Archbishop Beaton, 506, 508, 516—of Lord Seton to Archbishop Beaton, 517—of —— Beaton to Archbishop Beaton, 519—of Mr Beatoun to Archbishop Beatoun, 523 526, 528, 530, 532, 533—of Mary (Queen) to Archbishop Beatoun, 536—of M. Arnault to Archbishop Beatoun, 537—of Lord Ogilvy to Archbishop Beatoun, 539, 541, 550—of George Douglas to Archbishop Beatoun, 544—of Queen Mary, postscript by Nau to, 545—of the Duke of Lennox to Archbishop Beatoun, 552—of —— Bruce to Archbishop Beatoun, 546—of Don Bernardino de Mendoza to Archbishop Beatoun, 555—of Secretary Nau to Archbishop Beatoun, 558, 560—from Bothwell to the King of Denmark, 596—from Sir A. Paulet to Walsingham, regarding the part played by the "honest man" with Queen Mary's letters, 599—of Gilbert Gifford to Walsingham, touching the "practising in hand" with Queen Mary's letters, 602.

Liddesdale, Bothwell in, i. 212.

Lindsay, Lord, joins the conspiracy against Riccio, i. 132—signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, 342—attends the Conference at York, 401.

Linlithgow, i. 306, 307.

Livingston, Lord, i. 195, 203—accompanies Queen Mary into England, 390—Queen Mary's commissioner at the Conference at York, 401.

Lochinvar, the Laird of, comes with reinforcements to Queen Mary at Carberry Hill, i. 337—informs Queen Mary that he had seen letters by Morton, stating that the Queen of England regarded the Chatsworth treaty as a farce to amuse Mary and her Catholic allies, ii. 32.

Lochleven Castle, i. 248—Queen Mary conveyed to, 340—names of the lords who signed the order for her captivity in, 342—escape of Queen Mary from, 386—verification of the locality of Queen Mary's prison in the castle of, *ib.*

Lords, the insurgent, promise to restore the patrimony of the Church, and so gain over the Reformed clergy, i. 354—offer a reward for the apprehension of Bothwell, 365—repeat to Elizabeth their assertion that the queen had been forcibly carried off by Bothwell, 361—if the letters alleged to be written by Mary were genuine, the lords knew this to be false, 362—they inform Throgmorton, a fortnight after this, that they have proofs of Mary's guilt, *ib.*

Lords of the Congregation join the English army under Lord Grey, i. 41—besiege Leith, 42.
Lorraine, Cardinal of, i. 57—princes of, 20, 24—their determination to crush the Reformation in Scotland, 31—plot for their destruction, 34.
Lumley, Lord, a party to the conspiracy of Ridolphi, ii. 48.
Luss, Lord, i. 191, 195.

Macgill, James, forbidden to come into Elizabeth's presence, i. 396—attends the Conference at York, 401—sent as commissioner to London, ii. 35.
Madrid, reception of the news of the Massacre of St Bartholomew at, ii. 145.
Maitland, John, Abbot of Coldingham, accused of complicity in the murder of Darnley by John Binning, i. 262.
Maitland, Sir Richard, father of the Secretary, receives valuable grants of land, i. 300.
Maitland, William, of Lethington, sent to London to seek the aid of the Queen of England in behalf of the Lords of the Congregation, i. 31—demands the withdrawal of the French from Scotland, 46—sent on a special mission to Elizabeth, 56—made one of Queen Mary's principal advisers, 75—unites with Darnley and Morton in a conspiracy to murder Riccio, 125—ulterior objects of the conspiracy, 131—retires to the Highlands, 145—Darnley's aversion to him, 148—motives which induced him to join in the plot against Darnley, 149, 179—pardoned by Queen Mary, 153—suggests a divorce of the queen from her husband Darnley, 163—his statement that Murray would look through his fingers at Darnley's murder, 243—member of the Secret Council, at which the depositions of Darnley's murderers were taken, 245—implicated in the murder of Darnley by Ormiston, 260—political intrigue a necessity of his existence, 316—leader of the queen's enemies, 329—interview with Du Croc, 344—justifies the conduct of the insurgent lords in imprisoning the queen, 345—his statement that she had declared to him that she wished only to live and die with Bothwell contradicted by James Beton, *ib.*—his statement that the death of the queen would cause all the lords to join the confederates, 367—his object in accusing the Hamiltons of proposing to take the queen's life, 368—signs the Act of Council accusing Queen Mary of the murder of her husband, 379—accused by Mary of the murder of Darnley, 399—attends the Conference at York, 401—forms a project of a marriage between Mary Queen of Scots and the Duke of Norfolk, 418—coldness between him and the Regent Murray, 491—is convinced of Murray's treachery, 492—is accused by Murray of the murder of the king, and arrested at Stirling, 493—rescued by Kirkaldy of Grange, *ib.*—joins the party of the queen, 494—predicts that Elizabeth will never of her own accord set Queen Mary free, ii. 28—denounced as an atheist by John Knox, 154—complains to the kirk-session, 156—Knox's reply to his complaint, 157—the chief author of all the troubles of England as well as Scotland, 158—his reputation for ability and scholarship, 159—his political character, 160—taken prisoner by Sir William Drury in the surrender of Edinburgh Castle, 171—takes poison and dies, 172.
Mar, Earl of, signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, i. 342—is made Regent, ii. 97—as Regent of Scotland, consents to the proposal to put Queen Mary to death if she were delivered up by Elizabeth, and asks for money, 150—correspondence as to the surrender of Queen Mary to, 565.
Maron, M., arrives on business with the property of Queen Mary in France, ii. 278.
Martigues, Count de, defeats the besiegers of Leith, i. 42—offers to set Queen Mary at liberty if the King of France will give him troops, 358.
Mary of England succeeds to the throne, i. 19—her persecutions, *ib.*
Mary of Lorraine, her influence against the Reformation, i. 12—visits France, 16—has an interview with Edward VI., *ib.*—is made Regent of Scotland, *ib.*—her character, 17—proposes the establishment of a standing army, *ib.*—abandons the proposal, 18—loses the confidence of the French party and of the Reformers, 20—is charged with falsehood by Knox, 22—makes attempts to come to terms with the Protestant chiefs, 26—retires to the fortress of Dunbar, *ib.*—receives reinforcements from France, *ib.*—is deposed by the Lords of the Congregation, 27—preparations in France to assist her with an army of 20,000 men, 32—her position after the treaty of Berwick, 40—retires to Edinburgh Castle, 41—her failing health, 43, 45—applies for a surgeon, 45—accedes to the terms offered by the Congrega-

tion, 46—has an interview with the Lords of the Congregation, 48—recommends the withdrawal of the French and English forces from Scotland, *ib.*—her death, 49—her remains denied the rites of Christian burial, *ib.*—receives a visit on her deathbed from the Protestant preacher Willock, *ib.*

Mary Queen of Scots, accession of, i. 9—proposed marriage of, with Prince Edward of England, *ib.*—marriage of, with the Dauphin of France, 15—departure for France, *ib.*—project of her marriage to Edward VI. revived, 16—married to the Dauphin, 19—assumes the arms of England, 20—becomes Queen of France, 23—her pretensions to the crown of England, 33—displays the arms of England with those of Scotland and France, *ib.*—takes precedence of her husband in France, *ib.*—names plenipotentiaries to treat with Queen Elizabeth on the death of the Queen-Regent, 49—refuses to ratify the treaty of Edinburgh, 53—is informed that her religion is prohibited on pain of death, 57—accused of murdering Francis II., 59—solicited to return to Scotland, 61—her abilities and attachment to her religion, 63—determines to return to Scotland, *ib.*—applies to Elizabeth for a safe-conduct, 64—complains of Elizabeth's want of courtesy in refusing her a safe-conduct, 65—her replies to Throgmorton regarding the treaty of Edinburgh and her assumption of the arms of England, 66—escapes the English squadron and arrives at Leith, 68—hopelessness of her prospects on her return to Scotland, 70—her person and character described, 71—regards Knox as her worst enemy in Scotland, *ib.*—interview with Knox, 72—chooses two of the leaders of the Reformation as her advisers, 75—sanctions a scheme for a settled income to the Protestant clergy, *ib.*—replies to the congratulations of Elizabeth, 76—her alleged determination to overthrow the Protestant religion, 77—continues on friendly terms with Elizabeth, 79—her cheerfulness and demeanour at the Council, 84—visits Aberdeenshire, 87—her attempts to conciliate Knox repelled, 90—her interest in the struggle with the Huguenot rebels in France, 92—remonstrates with Knox on the persecution of the Catholics, 96—her suitors, 97—prefers Don Carlos, *ib.*—proposed meeting with Queen Elizabeth, *ib.*—recommended by Elizabeth to marry Lord Dudley, 98—her first interview with Lord Darnley, 101—is privately married to him at Stirling, 103—her reply to the remonstrance of the Assembly against the celebration of Mass in the queen's chapel, 107—announces her intention of marrying Darnley, 108—is informed that Murray and Argyll intend to murder Darnley and seize her person, *ib.*—summons Atholl and Ruthven to attend her to Edinburgh, *ib.*—summons the Crown vassals to aid her against Murray, 110—is publicly married to Darnley at Holyrood, and gives him the title of king, 111—prepares to give battle to the insurgents, 113—advances by Stirling into Fife, 114—imposes a fine on Dundee, *ib.*—returns to Edinburgh, *ib.*—applies to Philip of Spain and the King of France for aid in suppressing the rebellion, *ib.*—her disappointment at the reply of the French king, 115—disperses the insurgent nobles, 118—reply to Elizabeth's demand that she should send her husband back to England, *ib.*—her abilities and address conspicuous in the suppression of the rebellion, 120—her clemency to the rebels, *ib.*—receives Murray again into her confidence, 121—is invited to join the confederacy of the Catholic Powers for the suppression of Protestantism, 125—assertions of Robertson, Tytler, and Froude that she signed this League examined, *ib.*—evidence of the fact insufficient, 126—opens Parliament in person, 136—her bearing in presence of the murderers of Riccio, 138—her subsequent condition, 141—succeeds in persuading Darnley to fly with her from Edinburgh, 143—returns to Edinburgh, 147—pardons Murray and his associates, *ib.*—is convinced that Darnley's declaration of innocence in the matter of Riccio's murder is false, 149—broken-hearted, contemplates retiring to France, *ib.*—has a presentiment that she will not survive her confinement, and makes her will, 150—bequests of her jewels, 151—birth of her son, 152—allegations as to her scandalous conduct on the occasion of her visit to Alloa, 153—pardons Maitland, *ib.*—proceeds on a visit to the Earl of Mar, *ib.*—goes to Jedburgh to hold an assize, 157—visits Bothwell at Hermitage Castle, 158—misrepresentations of this visit, 160—seized with fever at Jedburgh, 161—returns to Edinburgh and resides at Craigmillar, 162—expresses a conditional approval of the proposal of a divorce from her husband Darnley, 164—subsequently refuses to entertain the proposal of a divorce, 166—baptism of

the young prince, 167 — accused by Buchanan of administering poison to Darnley, 169 — pardons Morton and his accomplices, *ib.* — falsehood of Buchanan's libels upon her, 172—no contemporary reports concerning her alleged misconduct with Bothwell in her husband's lifetime, 173 —restores the consistorial jurisdiction of the Archbishop of St Andrews, 176—returns from Stirling to Edinburgh with the infant prince, 179—hears alarming rumours of her husband's intentions, 181—sets out to visit him in Glasgow, 182—unfounded assertions regarding her conduct in the interview with him, 183—her alleged correspondence with Bothwell from Glasgow, 187—two of these letters shown to be forgeries, 188-201—examination of the statements in the postscript to the second letter, 201—the forged letters compared with her genuine letters, 202—nothing heard of her intimacy with Bothwell before her husband's death, 204—different versions of the second letter, 208—contrast between the first and last half of this letter, 209—difficulty as to its date, 210—how was it sent? 211—Laing's conjectures on this point, 212—chronological objections to the two Glasgow letters insurmountable, 214—deposition of Paris not made public in her lifetime, *ib.*—the letters produced at the York Conference were in the Scotch language, 218—the same letters afterwards produced at the Westminster Conference in French, 219—doubts as to the original language of these letters, 220—proved by Goodall to have been originally written in Scotch, *ib.*—examination of the remaining letters said to have been written by the queen before her husband's death, 221 — certified copy of letter A No. 3, *ib.* — difference between its tone and that of the others, 224—this letter not addressed to Bothwell at all, but to Darnley, 225 — letter No. 4 originally written in French, 226—this letter also written to Darnley and not to Bothwell, 227—examination of the suspicious passages in it, 228—an interpolated passage in it attracted the attention of the commissioners, 229—letter styled "concerning the departure of Margaret Carwood," 230—contains nothing to show that it was addressed to Bothwell, or referred to Margaret Carwood, 231—the only suspicious passage in this letter probably an interpolation, 233 — the whole eight letters first printed in Buchanan's 'Detection' in Latin, 234—the French edition states that some were written in French and some in Scotch, *ib.* — importance of this testimony of a contemporary writer, 235—examination of Laing's arguments on this point, 236—Cecil's testimony as to the language of the copies left by Murray, *ib.*—no French originals of the letters written in Scotch ever existed, 238—improbability of the violent attachment expressed by the assumed writer, *ib.* — her prejudice against Bothwell, 239—contemporary Scottish documents abound in French phrases, 240—arrival with Darnley at Edinburgh, 241—her conduct on the occasion of the quarrel between Darnley and Lord Robert Stewart, 242—visits Darnley on the night of his murder, 244—said to have been in the room with Darnley when the powder was placed below it, 247—monstrous statements in the depositions of French Paris regarding her intercourse with Bothwell, 253—alleged removal of the bed at Kirk-of-Field, 258—possibility of her being ignorant of the plot against Darnley, 267—testimony from his enemies that her reputation was unsullied down to the time of her husband's death, 270—slanderous rumours respecting her and Bothwell after that, *ib.*—receives a letter from her ambassador in Paris informing her of impending danger, *ib.*—her demeanour on hearing the news of Darnley's murder, 272—takes up her residence in the Castle of Edinburgh, *ib.*—accused of inactivity after the murder of her husband, 274—reasons for this seeming inactivity, *ib.* — suspected in Spain of having murdered Darnley in order to establish heresy throughout the kingdom, 277 — stories of her intimacy with Bothwell within eight days of her husband's death transmitted to England, 279—subject to fainting fits, 280—assertion that she gave Bothwell the command of Edinburgh Castle, 281—anxious to retire to France, *ib.*—assertion that she signed two contracts to marry Bothwell within a few weeks after her husband's death, 283—summons Parliament on the murder of Darnley, 287—generally held responsible for the acquittal of Bothwell, 298—goes to Stirling to visit the prince, 306—statement of her enemies that she went for the purpose of poisoning him, *ib.*—leaves Stirling and comes to Linlithgow, 307—is carried off by Bothwell on her way home, *ib.* — place where this occurred, 308—alleged letters written to Bothwell

from Stirling, *ib.* — these letters forged to prove that she was a party to Bothwell's carrying her away, 315 —the men who produced these forgeries were previously guilty of treason and murder, and therefore not incapable of forgery, 316—consents to become the wife of Bothwell, 319—her own narrative of her fatal visit to Dunbar, *ib.*—terms of her marriage-contract with Bothwell, 327—celebration of the marriage, 328 —becomes the prisoner rather than the wife of Bothwell, 333—goes to Borthwick Castle, *ib.*—escapes with Bothwell from Borthwick to Dunbar, 334—gathers forces at Dunbar and takes the field at Carberry Hill, 335 —complains that the lords who had first recommended her to marry Bothwell were now in arms against her for doing so, 336—interposes to prevent Bothwell from engaging in single combat, *ib.*—tries to spin out the negotiations in expectation of reinforcements, 337—surrenders herself and makes terms for Bothwell, *ib.* — conducted by Kirkaldy of Grange to the insurgent camp, 338 —brought to Edinburgh amid the insults of the mob, 339—her anger against Lord Lindsay, *ib.*—a prisoner in the house of the Lord Provost, *ib.* —abandons herself to despair, 340—removed to Holyrood and thence to Lochleven, *ib.* —assertion that she broke faith with the insurgents by writing a letter to Bothwell, *ib.* — alleged discovery of letters in her handwriting implicating her in the murder of Darnley, 347—the insurgent lords seize her jewels, 354—she is denied an interview with the ambassadors of Queen Elizabeth and of France, 360—the clergy daily denounce her as a murderess, 362 — she is compelled by the threats of the Lords Lindsay and Ruthven to resign her crown, 365—is visited by Murray at Lochleven, and craftily led to entreat him to accept the regency, 375—requests him also to take the custody of her jewels, 376 — Dumbarton Castle still holds out for her, *ib.*, 384 — she is formally charged with the murder of her husband and with intent to murder her child, 378 — escapes from Lochleven, 386 — takes the field at Hamilton, 387—her most prominent supporters are Protestants, *ib.* — list of nobles who joined her at Hamilton, *ib.*—defeated at Langside, 389—crosses the Solway and proceeds to Carlisle, 390—is made prisoner, 393 — her forcible detention a political blunder of the first magnitude, *ib.*—consents to the Conference at York in the belief that Elizabeth was her friend, 396—translations of her alleged letters into Scotch sent to the Conference, 398—her interview with Lord Scrope and Sir Francis Knollys at Carlisle, *ib.*—charges Morton and Maitland with the murder of her husband, 399—removed to Bolton Castle, *ib.*—her instructions to her commissioners at York, 401—declares if any writings implicating her in the murder are produced they are forged, and that there are persons who can counterfeit her hand, 402—examination of the letters produced against her, 408 —accusation founded on a letter produced at this time and never again heard of, 409, 451—production of a warrant alleged to be signed by her, authorising the nobles to sign the bond subscribed at Aynslie's supper, 410, 451—she complains of Murray's clandestine proceedings, 411—agrees to the removal of the Conference to London, *ib.*—proposal to remove her to Tutbury, 420—she begins to comprehend her true position and demands permission to appear in person at the Conference, 423—accusations against her in the Book of Articles, 434—none of her servants could be induced to appear against her, 453—commands her commissioners to charge Murray and his accomplices with the murder of her husband, 460 —her answer to the charge of intent to murder her child, *ib.*—scheme of Cecil's to entrap her into resigning the crown, 463 — preparations to remove her to Tutbury, 464— —she receives as genuine the professions of goodwill made by Knollys, 466—but is at length awakened to the real designs of her enemies, and declares that she will prefer death to the ignominious terms proposed, 486 —writes a characteristic letter in behalf of Willie Douglas, 469—Cecil declares to the commissioners that there has been nothing sufficiently produced or shown against her whereby Elizabeth should conceive any evil opinion of her, 473—her commissioners protest against her detention after she has been declared innocent, 477—she applies to the French ambassador, 478—is removed to Tutbury, 479—her prospects more favourable, 486—popular feeling in her favour, 487—coalition of English nobles for her restoration and marriage with the Duke of Norfolk, 489

—she consents, subject to the approval of Elizabeth, *ib.*—convention of nobles at Perth to consider whether her marriage with Bothwell could be annulled, 491—growing strength of her party in Scotland, 495—the secret coalition for her marriage with Norfolk and restoration is betrayed to Elizabeth, 496—orders sent to put her immediately to death in the event of any rising of Norfolk's adherents, *ib.* — conference of her friends in London, and application to the Duke of Alva for troops, 497—she is removed from Tutbury to Coventry, 501—she pensions the assassin of the Regent Murray, 514—the whole of the Border country ready to rise in her behalf, 516—copies of her alleged contracts of marriage with Bothwell, 556—her love-sonnets, 563—plan for her escape from England, ii. 2 — story of a ship brought to Bristol for her abduction, 3—strength of her party in Scotland on the death of the Regent Murray, 5—seeks aid from the King of France against the invasion of Scotland by Elizabeth, 9—negotiations for her restoration intrusted to Cecil, 19—her interview with Cecil, 20—refuses to place the castles of Edinburgh and Dumbarton in the hands of Elizabeth, 21—proposed alteration in the treaty of Edinburgh amended by her, 22—refuses to agree that English fugitives in Scotland should be delivered up, 24—agrees that the young Prince James should be sent to England, 25—protest of Regent Lennox against her restoration, 29—finds that she has been once more deceived, and is prostrated by illness, 32—she is removed to Sheffield Castle, 33—two physicians sent to her by Elizabeth, *ib.*—writes to Elizabeth requiring the fulfilment of the treaty of Chatsworth, *ib.*—commissions the Bishop of Ross to intimate to Elizabeth that she will invoke the aid of foreign princes if the treaty is longer unfulfilled, 34—alleged discovery by Walsingham of a secret project for her marriage with the Duke of Anjou, 37 — her life in danger from Elizabeth's fury at this, 38—failure of the Chatsworth negotiations through a subterfuge of Morton's, 40—she accepts the proffered services of Ridolphi, 46—project for her liberation by Spanish troops aided by Norfolk and his friends, 48—her letters of instruction to Ridolphi, 50—she is now aware that her marriage with Bothwell was null and void, 51—the existence of the Papal dispensation for the marriage of Bothwell with Lady Jane Gordon concealed from her, 52—she falls into the trap prepared for her by Cecil and Sir John Hawkins, 61—darkness of her prospects on the arrest of the Duke of Norfolk, 66—increased stringency of her confinement, 69—her spirited remonstrance to Lord Burghley, 70—takes farewell of her discharged servants, 72—is treated with a degree of harshness which threatened to put an end to her existence, 76—offers to defray the expenses of her imprisonment on being taunted by Queen Elizabeth with the cost of her maintenance, 77 — her health declines rapidly, 78—no answer to her physician's remonstrances, *ib.*—a copy of Buchanan's 'Detection' sent to her, 80—a letter of hers produced against the Duke of Norfolk, 105, 108—violence of the Puritans against her, 117—both Houses of Parliament pass a bill of attainder against her, 118—Elizabeth, influenced by Leicester, rejects it, *ib.*—position and prospects of her party in Scotland, 133—ability with which she answered the charges of Elizabeth's commissioners at Sheffield, 122—effect of the news of the Massacre of St Bartholomew upon her prospects, 145—Cecil proposes to deliver her up to the regent, 146—Morton undertakes to have her executed within three hours of her arrival in Scotland, 149—terms upon which she was to be surrendered, 150—the treaty of Perth renders the plot for her execution in Scotland impracticable, 167—allowed to visit Buxton, 176—is refused the services of a priest, 177—contrast between her notions of religious toleration and those of Queen Elizabeth, *ib.*—seeks to propitiate Elizabeth with gifts of her own needlework, 181—the atrocious scheme of surrendering her to the regent for execution in Scotland revived, 183—loss of her friends by death, 185—learns that Bothwell before his death had formally declared her innocent of any participation in Darnley's death, 186—states that this declaration had been transmitted to Elizabeth and suppressed, *ib.*—Don John of Austria a suitor for her hand, 187—disapproves of his scheme for the invasion of England, 190—removed to Chatsworth from Sheffield Castle, 192—Leicester sent to watch her, *ib.*—receives information that Regent Morton desired a reconciliation, 198—becomes alarmed for the safety of her son on hearing

of Morton's arrest, 220—Walsingham threatens that Morton's execution would cost her her life, 215, 222—proposal that she should be associated with her son in the government, 232—sanctions conditionally the proposed expedition of the Duke of Guise for her liberation, 240—writes a long letter to Elizabeth recounting the history of all she had endured in England, 250—expresses her readiness to renounce all share in the government, 253—Elizabeth's ministers decide on retaining her in captivity, 255—her alleged letters to the Duke of Guise, 263—complains that her letters are intercepted by Wade the spy, 279—what passed between her and Beale on the last renewal of the negotiations for her release, 280—demands an inquiry into the scandal circulated by Lady Shrewsbury of her adulterous intercourse with her jailer the Earl of Shrewsbury, 284—her letter to Elizabeth detailing the scandals concerning the English queen repeated by Lady Shrewsbury, 285—she is removed from Sheffield Castle to Wingfield Manor, 287—her alleged letter to Sir Francis Englefield, 289—made amenable to the law of England by a special Act, 262—is anxious to win the friendship of Elizabeth, 293—refuses to believe in the treachery of the Master of Gray, 295—is removed from Wingfield Manor to Tutbury, 296—her wretched condition at Tutbury, 297, 303—abandoned by her son, 305—increase of the rigours of her imprisonment, 325—the irrepressible kindliness of her nature, 326—receives intelligence of the return of the banished lords, and the flight of Arran, 327—is removed from Tutbury to Chartley, 328—her proposed marriage to the Prince of Parma, 329—assents to the proposal of marriage with the Prince of Parma, 332—her letter to Charles Paget, 333—her correspondence betrayed to Walsingham by Gilbert Gifford, and opened and tampered with by Walsingham's agents, 338—devices of Walsingham to implicate her in the Babington conspiracy, 342—her correspondence with Morgan, 343—her alleged letter to Babington, 344—Babington's letter to her tampered with, 353—foundation of the charge of her having conspired against Elizabeth's life, *ib.*—notices Gifford's presence at Chartley, 357—her alleged answer to Babington's letter, 359—distinct traces of the forger's hand in it, 364—neither the original nor the copy of the cipher preserved, 368—a postscript added to it in Walsingham's office, *ib.*—suspicious nature of the fact that the ciphers of the two most important letters are missing and all the rest preserved, 374—improvement of her health at Chartley, 285—is removed to Tixall by stratagem and closely imprisoned, 386—her repositories ransacked, *ib.*—brought back to Chartley, 387—baptises the child of one of her secretaries by her own name, 388—her money is taken possession of by her jailer, 389—her secretaries conveyed to London, *ib.*—their alleged confessions, 390—opinion of the Crown lawyers as to her trial by a judge of assize, 410—search for authorities to prove that princes might be lawfully put to death, 411—resolution to bring her to trial at Fotheringay, 412—efforts made to conciliate King James, 413—denies the jurisdiction of Queen Elizabeth, 416—refuses to appear for trial, and defies Cecil, 417—is persuaded by Sir Christopher Hatton to appear under protest, 419—opening of her trial at Fotheringay, 420—her charge of forgery against Walsingham, 423—nature of the documents produced against her, 424—specific accusations against her, 426—produces the ring she had received from Elizabeth as a pledge of friendship and protection, 428—adjournment of the trial to the Star Chamber at Westminster, 430—disgraceful nature of the procedure in the trial, 431—sentenced to death, 435—her last request to Elizabeth, *ib.*—her letter to the Duke of Guise, 437—and to the Archbishop of Glasgow, 439—humiliating treatment of the queen, 440—intercessions in her behalf by the French ambassador, 443—fanatical enthusiasm of the populace in London on the proclamation of her sentence, 444—resolute attitude of the French Court met by the accusation of the French ambassador's complicity in a plot against Elizabeth's life, 445—reception of the news of her condemnation in Scotland, 446—efforts to induce King James to interfere in his mother's behalf, 447—she is told to prepare for death, 460—her demeanour in her last hours, 461—the Earl of Kent refuses to allow her women to be present at her death, 464—is led to the scaffold, 465—her dying statement, 466—is interrupted at her devotions, 467—prays for Queen Elizabeth, *ib.*—her death, 468—reception of the news of her death in London, 469—three English historians assert her innocence, 488—opinions of

Dr Johnson and John Wesley, 489—the universal interest excited by the story of her life, 496—correspondence as to her surrender to the Earls of Mar and Morton, 565—Bothwell's account of his marriage with her, 587—fragment of a paper on Adversity in her handwriting, 605.
Mary Tudor, Queen Mary claims to be the heiress of, i. 20.
Mass, the celebration of, prohibited, i. 54, 101—the Assembly of the Kirk declares it must be wholly abolished, 107—four priests condemned to death at Stirling for celebrating it, 485.
Maxwell, Lord, expected with a Spanish force in the Solway, ii. 475.
Medea, an oversight in Queen Mary's allusion to, i. 228.
Medici, Catherine de, i. 24—complains to the Court of Spain of the barbarous policy of Elizabeth, 50—regains her lost influence, 58—slights Queen Mary, 63—conciliates the Protestants, 90—her dislike to Queen Mary, 116—stands aloof from the confederacy of the Catholic Powers for the suppression of Protestantism, 128—rumour attributes the plot against Darnley to, 277—dissuades the King of France from interfering to help Queen Mary, 358—resolves on the death of Admiral Coligni, ii. 137—secret conclave of her accomplices, 139—tempts her son to the perpetration of the Massacre of St Bartholomew, 141—proposes a French marriage for James VI., 273.
Medina Sidonia, Duke of, ii. 481.
Melrose, tombs of the Douglases at, destroyed, i. 15.
Melville, Sir Andrew, Queen Mary's last message to, ii. 464.
Melvill, Sir James, his statement that Bothwell boasted he would marry the queen whether she would or not, i. 321—improbability of his story concerning Lord Herries, 324—his story that Bothwell threatened his life, *ib.*—deputed to offer Murray the regency, 373.
Melvill, Robert, an emissary of the insurgent nobles, obtains money from Queen Elizabeth, i. 116—letter of his regarding Darnley's murder, 245—writes to Cecil of the offers of assistance from France, 325—corresponds with Mary's enemies in England, 329—applies on behalf of the insurgent lords for assistance from England, 345—obtains from Mary a letter enjoining Westmoreland and his adherents to offer no violence to Murray on his journey northwards, 483.
Mildmay, Sir Walter, one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, i. 427—accompanies Cecil to Chatsworth, ii. 20.
Mill, Walter, the Reformer, burnt, i. 22.
Monasteries and religious houses in Scotland, destruction of, i. 60.
Moncontour, defeat of Coligni at, i. 500.
Monluc (de) John, Bishop of Valence, i. 43.
Mons, capture of, by Count Louis of Nassau, ii. 136.
Montague, Lord, a party to the conspiracy of Ridolphi, ii. 48.
Montmorency, Constable of France, i. 24—dissuades the king from sending aid to Queen Mary, 358.
Moretta, Count, his report that Darnley's cries were heard on the night of his murder, i. 269—his interview with De Silva in London, 276.
Morgan, Thomas, a partisan of Mary, is involved in Gifford's plot for obtaining possession of her correspondence, ii. 334—his letters to Queen Mary, 344—draws up a note for Mary to copy and send to Babington, 345.
Morton, Earl of, sent on a special mission to Elizabeth, i. 56—made Chancellor of Scotland, 88—unites with Darnley and Maitland in a conspiracy to murder Riccio, 125—ulterior objects of the conspiracy, 131—joins the conspiracy against Riccio, 132—flees to England, 144—deprived of the Great Seal, 148—motives which induced him to join in the plot against Darnley, 149, 179—has an interview with Bothwell and Maitland, and becomes acquainted with the conspiracy against Darnley, 179—Bothwell's journey to Whittingham to meet, 213—is one of the Lords of Secret Council before whom the depositions of Darnley's murderers were taken, 245—his confession, 261—his crafty dealing with the other conspirators against Darnley, 264—goes to St Andrews after Darnley's murder, 275—confirmed in his titles and estates, 300—his confession that he subscribed the bond in favour of Bothwell at Aynslie's supper, 304—avarice his ruling passion, *ib.*—universally believed to be capable of any crime, 316—his delivering up of the Earl of Northumberland, 317—appears at Borthwick with an army, 333—signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, 342—signs the Act of Council accusing Queen Mary of the murder of her husband, 379—accused by Mary of the murder of Darnley, 399—attends the Conference at York, 401—Queen Mary charged

with depriving him of the Great Seal for no offence, 435—exerts himself against the party of the queen on the death of Regent Murray, ii. 5—sent as commissioner to London, and justifies the deposition of Queen Mary, 35—entreats Elizabeth not to withdraw her support, 36—when in London receives a letter from Denmark addressed to Lennox, of which he sends a mutiliated copy to Elizabeth, 41—brings the silver casket containing the alleged letters of Queen Mary a second time to London, but does not venture to allude to their existence, 42—promises to Killigrew that if Queen Mary be delivered up, she will be put to death within three hours of her arrival in Scotland, 149—made regent, 162—offers to treat with Kirkaldy for the surrender of the castle of Edinburgh, 164—demands from Cecil the surrender of Kirkaldy of Grange and others taken in Edinburgh Castle, 171—seizes the Crown jewels in Edinburgh Castle, 175—his message to Mary proposing a reconciliation, 198—complaints of his tyranny, avarice, and general unpopularity, 200—conspiracy against him, headed by the Earls of Atholl and Argyll, 203—resigns the regency, and retires to Lochleven Castle, *ib.*—takes the young king prisoner, 204—takes the castle of Hamilton, 205—his rancorous spirit against the Hamiltons, 206—conspires against the life of Aubigny, Earl of Lennox, 210—discovery of his intrigues with Sir Robert Bowes, 211—Sir James Balfour becomes his mortal enemy *ib.*—proposes to retire to Germany, 212—accused of the murder of Darnley, 213—conveyed to Dumbarton Castle, 214—his demeanour in prison, 220—correspondence as to the surrender of Queen Mary to, 565.

Murray, Lord James Stewart, Earl of, i. 88—opposes Mary's marriage with Darnley, 105—accuses Lennox and his son of a design to murder him, 109—takes the field against the queen, 110—flees to England on the approach of the queen's troops, 118—enters into a bond with Darnley to give him the crown-matrimonial and the succession failing issue of Mary, 135—returns to Edinburgh after the murder of Riccio, 141—has an interview with the queen, *ib.*—pardoned by Queen Mary, 147—disclaims connection with the murderers of Riccio, but uses his influence in their behalf, *ib.*—his disclaimer of complicity in the plot for the murder of Darnley, 166—his motives for joining in the plot against Darnley, 179—his journal produced at the Conference at Westminster, 189—his interview with De Silva, the Spanish ambassador, 214—his account to De Silva of the queen's letter to Bothwell, 215—this account does not tally with the Glasgow letter, 216—the letter described by him to De Silva must have been the first draft of the forged letter, 218—is present at the quarrel between Darnley and Lord Robert Stewart at Kirk-of-Field, 242—leaves Edinburgh for St Andrews the day before Darnley's murder, 243—his statement that between thirty and forty persons were concerned in Darnley's murder, 245—remains in Fife for some weeks after Darnley's murder, 275—entertains the English ambassador Killigrew and the murderers of Darnley, 285—goes to France, 292—makes his will, appointing Queen Mary guardian of his only daughter, 293—obtains a ratification of the earldom of Murray from the Earl of Huntly, 300—evidence that he signed the bond in behalf of Bothwell, 302—his name first in the Cotton Library copy of the bond subscribed at Aynslie's supper, *ib.*—gives a receipt for a silver box containing letters said to have been written by Queen Mary, 347—returns to Scotland, 371—Mr Froude's description of his conduct in France, 372—the profitable nature of his trip to France, 373—the regency of Scotland offered to him, *ib.*—proceeds to Lochleven and adroitly persuades Mary to entreat him to accept the regency, 375—receives the custody of Queen Mary's jewels, 376—obtains possession of the castle of Dunbar, *ib.*—is proclaimed regent, *ib.*—bribes Sir James Balfour to surrender the castle of Edinburgh, *ib.*—summons Parliament, 377—burns the bond for the murder of Darnley, *ib.*—is confirmed in the regency by Parliament, 379—severities inflicted on the Border country by him, 382—execution of Hay, Hepburn, Powrie, and Dalgleish by him, 383—dissatisfaction with his regency, *ib.*—sends Nicolas Elphinstone to London to offer Queen Mary's jewels for sale to Elizabeth, 384—applies to Charles IX. to take the young Prince James under his protection, 385—refuses all offers of accommodation from Mary previous to the engagement at Langside, 388—singularity of his request to Elizabeth that the translated copies of the alleged letters of Queen Mary should satisfy

for probation, 397—attends the Conference at York, 401—pretends that he was loath to accuse his sister of the murder, 403—addresses four queries to the English commissioners, 406—produces the Book of Articles at the Westminster Conference, but supplies no copy of it, 431—statement in the Book of Articles that Queen Mary nominated him regent without his knowledge or desire, 445—makes a last attempt to evade the production of proof, and asks the Book of Articles and the Act of Parliament to be received as conclusive evidence of Mary's guilt, 446—produces a coffer with letters said to be in Queen Mary's hand, 447—exhibits the letters, but leaves only copies, 448—his journal produced as evidence at Westminster, 454—allowed to depart on account of the unquiet state of Scotland, and the failure of the evidence against Queen Mary, 473—sent home with his proofs at the very time when he and his associates were charged with the king's murder, 474—receives a sum of money from the English Treasury, 475—delays his departure to Scotland, 480—the gentry of Yorkshire and Durham determine to attack him on his way north, *ib.*—revives the project of Mary's marriage to the Duke of Norfolk, *ib.*—professes the sincerest affection for his sister Mary, though he had accused her of the most horrid crimes, 481—returns to Scotland and consolidates his power, 484—arrests the Duke of Chatelherault and Lord Herries, *ib.*—issues a proclamation accusing Queen Mary afresh of the murder of her husband, 485—a coldness arises between him and Maitland, 491—betrays the confidence of the Duke of Norfolk, 498—asks for a sum of money as the price of his continued alliance with England, 509—moves the Queen of England to deliver up Queen Mary to him, 510—difficulty of understanding his motives in desiring the surrender of the queen so earnestly, 511—Knox at this time acting in concert with him, *ib.*—his death at Linlithgow, 512—his character and abilities, *ib.*—his widow refuses to deliver up Queen Mary's jewels, 513—portions of his journal from a copy marked by Cecil, 555—copy of his answer to the protestation of the Earls of Huntly and Argyll, 573—his letter to Elizabeth produced against the Duke of Norfolk, ii. 104.

Murray of Tullibardine announces to Throgmorton the project of putting Queen Mary to death, as suggested by Archbishop Hamilton, i. 367—commission to apprehend Bothwell issued to, 369.

Musselburgh burnt by Lord Grey, i. 14, n.

NAPLES, Joanna, Queen of, i. 443.

Navarre, Anthony de Bourbon, King of, i. 37—mortally wounded, 91.

Naworth, castle of, i. 515.

Nelson, Thomas, a servant of Darnley, i. 189—his deposition concerning the removal of Darnley's bed at Kirk-of-Field, 258—unhurt by the explosion, 268.

Netherlands, butcheries of the Duke of Alva in the, i. 14—combination to secure the independence of, ii. 136—Elizabeth's intervention in the war in, 317—four towns of, delivered up to her, 320.

Niddry, Queen Mary at, i. 387.

Nobles, conduct of the, during the reign of Queen Mary, i. 332—insurgent, in the field against Bothwell, 333—meet the queen's forces at Carberry Hill, 335—terms proposed by them, *ib.*—they allow Bothwell to escape from Carberry Hill, 338—bond signed by them, 343—difficulty they found in giving an intelligible explanation of their conduct, 344.

Norfolk, Duke of, invades Scotland, and is defeated by Huntly, i. 8—concludes the treaty of Berwick, 40, 42, 44—is one of Elizabeth's commissioners at the Conference at York, 399—at first believes the alleged letters of Mary to be genuine, 412—project for a marriage between him and Mary Queen of Scots, 418—Murray revives the project of his marriage with Queen Mary, 480—sent to the Tower, 496—wants the ability and inclination for the enterprise, 498—Murray betrays his confidence, *ib.*—he declares that the Earl of Murray sought his life, 499—sets his face against the plan for Mary's escape from England, ii. 2—efforts to gain him over to the conspiracy of Ridolphi, 46—his feebleness of character, 47—consents to an interview with Ridolphi, 48—letter of instructions to Ridolphi in his name, 49—his complicity in the conspiracy of Ridolphi discovered by Cecil, 65—arrested, and begs for his life, 66—his trial, 100—convicted and sentenced to death, 114—Elizabeth at first refuses to carry out the sentence, 115—his execution, 116—copy of his letter to Queen Elizabeth, with an abstract of matters against Queen Mary, 497.

Norris, Sir Henry, English ambassador

at Paris, his interview with the King of France, i. 357.
Northampton, Marquis of, one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, i. 427.
Northumberland, Earl of, in conference with Queen Mary's friends in London, i. 497—open rebellion of, 500—flees to Scotland, 502—is betrayed and given up by Morton, 503—sold by Morton to Elizabeth, ii. 125—his examination, 128—his execution at York 130.

Ochiltree, Lord, father-in-law of Knox, i. 112—returns to Edinburgh, 141—signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, 342.
Ogilvie, Lord, wounded in a street fight, i. 86.
Olborg, Captain, seizure of Bothwell at Carmsund by, ii. 594.
Orange, Prince of, assassinated, ii. 281.
Orkney and Shetland Islands, Bothwell offers to surrender them to the King of Denmark as they were before, ii. 597.
Orleans invested by the Duke of Guise, i. 93.
Ormiston, "the Black Laird," confession of, i. 259—urges Bothwell on his way to his trial to look more cheerful, 296.
Oysell (D'), commander of the Queen-Regent's forces, i. 41.

Paiges, Sebastian, his alleged marriage with Margaret Carwood, i. 231—his marriage with Christina Hogg, 244.
Papacy, petition of the Reformers to the Convention of 1560 for the abolition of, i. 53.
Paris, French, or Nicolas Hubert, i. 191, 211, 212—his deposition not made public during Mary's lifetime, 214—not produced at Westminster, though in Scotland, 249—his delivery to Captain Clark, an emissary of Murray, at Roeskilde in Denmark, 250—his execution, *ib.*—monstrous statements in his depositions, 251—unsuccessful attempts of Hume and Laing to maintain his credit, 254—double fraud of the notary Hay in connection with his depositions, 256.
Parliament, constitution of, in Scotland, i. 3—conspiracy of Morton, Maitland, and Darnley, to prevent the assembling of, 125—dissolved by Darnley, 141—passes the first Act of Toleration, 299—secures the murderers of Darnley in their titles and estates, *ib.*—summoned by Murray, 377—confirms him in the regency, 379—freedom of discussion in, unknown, 382—meeting of, at Stirling, ii. 94.
Parma, Duchess of, attempts to put an end to the war in Scotland, i. 36.
Parma, Duke of, unable to join the Spanish fleet at Calais for the invasion of England, ii. 483.
Parry, Dr William, denounces the measure enacted against the English Catholics, and is arrested for treason, ii. 298—his letter to Queen Elizabeth, 299—unexplained mystery about his case, 301.
Parsons, Robert, sent from France as agent of the Jesuits to support the proposal for associating Queen Mary in the government with her son, ii. 233.
Paulet, Sir Amias, appointed jailer to Queen Mary, ii. 325—prohibits her from giving charity, *ib.*—his mysterious correspondence with Philipps and Walsingham, 346—refuses emphatically to obey Elizabeth's letter suggesting Queen Mary's assassination, 456—letters from, to Sir F. Walsingham regarding the way the "honest man" has played his part with Queen Mary's letters, 599.
Pembroke, Earl of, one of the commissioners at the Conference at Westminster, i. 427.
Pensions, English, given to Scottish noblemen, list of, i. 575.
Perth, monasteries of, destroyed, i. 23—violent debate on the question of the annulment of Mary's marriage with Bothwell in the convention of nobles at, 492—treaty of, in which the queen's party acknowledge Morton as regent, ii. 166.
Philip II. of Spain, his religious persecutions, i. 14—his tardy intervention between Elizabeth and the royalists in Scotland, 36—reason for his prejudice against Mary, 276—gives his assent to the conspiracy of Ridolphi, ii. 55—assembles an army in the Netherlands for the invasion of England, 480—failure of the expedition, 485.
Philipps, Thomas, employed by Walsingham to intercept the correspondence of Queen Mary and her friends, ii. 289—the decipherer of Queen Mary's ciphered correspondence, 338—his mysterious correspondence with Paulet and Walsingham, 346—his probable tampering with Babington's letter to Queen Mary, 353—proceeds to Chartley, 354—his letter sending to Walsingham the deciphered copy of Queen Mary's letter to Babington, 371—returns to London, 372—proof of his skill in forgery, 380.
Pinkie, battle of, i. 15.
Piracy, English, in the sixteenth century, ii. 57.

Porteous, Adam, remission to, for his part in the seizure of the queen's person, i. 568.
Powrie, William, execution of, i. 383—his deposition produced at the Westminster Conference, 450.
Protestantism established in England, i. 21 — suppressed in France, *ib.* — band for the suppression of, subscribed by the Catholic Powers, 126.
Protestants, persecution of, by Cardinal Beatoun, i. 13—persecution of, revived, 21.

RANDOLPH or Randall, Thomas, his letter to Cecil regarding Queen Mary's return to Scotland, i. 67—letters showing the disposition and habits of Queen Mary, 83—change in the tone of his letters after Darnley's arrival, 106—is privy to the conspiracy of Murray and Argyll to murder Darnley and seize the queen's person, 109, 110—writes to Cecil that Queen Mary had incurred the universal contempt of her subjects, 111—complains of the treatment of John Tamworth, the bearer of an extraordinary message from Elizabeth to Mary, 119—letter to Cecil stating that Queen Mary had subscribed the confederacy of Catholic Powers for the suppression of Protestantism, 126—letter to Leicester announcing his knowledge of the conspiracy for the murder of Riccio and other objects "worse than these," 133—supplies money to the chief conspirator, Murray, 134—is sent out of Edinburgh by Queen Mary, *ib.*—sent to Edinburgh after the death of Regent Murray, ii. 6—widens the breach between the rival parties, 7—obliged to fly to Berwick, *ib.*—sent to Edinburgh to support Morton, accused of the murder of Darnley, 214—addresses the Scottish Parliament in favour of Morton, 216—revives the plot for the assassination of Aubigny, Earl of Lennox, and imprisoning the king, 217—his plot is discovered, *ib.*—he is fired at, and flees to England, 218.
Ratcliffe, Egremont, joins the party of Queen Mary, i. 497.
Raulet, Queen Mary's French secretary, i. 123.
Redpeth, Andrew, remission to, for his share in the seizure of the queen's person near the river Almond, i. 568.
Reformation, division of Church lands at the, i. 2—influence of Mary of Lorraine against, 12 — progress of, after the death of Cardinal Beaton, 14 — progress of, after the death of Francis II., 59.
Reformers, the Scottish, persecution of, by Cardinal Beaton, i. 13—their intention to establish their religion by force, 21—the Covenant subscribed by, *ib.*—religious edifices destroyed by, 23—death of Henry II. a misfortune to, 25—their petition to the Convention of States of 1560, 53—dislike to their ascetic doctrines, 69—they insult the religion of the queen, 78—are roused by the prospect of Mary's union with the son of the Catholic Earl of Lennox, 107.
Renandie, La, ostensible leader of the conspiracy of Amboise, i. 37-39.
Reres, Lady, i. 195, 203.
Restalrig, English army encamped at, i. 41.
Rheims, entry of Queen Mary into, i. 33—conspiracy of, ii. 238.
Riccio, David, rises high in Mary's favour, i. 123—incurs the resentment of Darnley, 124—motives for the murder of, 130—apprised of his danger by a French astrologer, 136—circumstances of his murder, 138—ulterior objects of the murderers, 142—Bothwell's account of the murder, ii. 581.
Riccio, Joseph, accused of being connected with the murder of Darnley, i. 278.
Ridolphi, an agent of the Papal Court, conference of Mary's friends with, i. 497—is implicated in the rising of the northern lords, and advises Mary to appeal to the Catholic Powers, ii. 34—the conspiracy of, 43—details of his scheme for the restoration of Queen Mary by the aid of the Catholic Powers, 48—his letter of instructions, 49—receives a cordial reception from the Pope, 53—is unfavourably received at Madrid, *ib.*—represents to Philip of Spain that the murder of Elizabeth was one of the conditions of the plot, 54—secures the assent of Philip of Spain to his plot, 55—communication by him to Mary Queen of Scots, 502.
Robertson, Joseph, his statement of Queen Mary's bequests to Darnley, i. 151.
Robertson, Dr William, his account of Queen Mary's visit to Bothwell at Hermitage, i. 160—remarks on Queen Mary's demeanour to Darnley at Glasgow, 183—on the Glasgow letters, 196—on the characteristics of papers forged with a particular intention, 217—represents Murray as the purest of patriots and most unselfish of men, 430.
Rochefoucault, de la, Charles, named plenipotentiary by Queen Mary, i. 49.

Rokesby, Anthony, announces his brother's proposal to murder Bothwell, i. 369.
Rokesby, Christopher, a spy of Cecil's, i. 152, 279—proposes to undertake the murder of Bothwell at Spynie Castle, 369.
Rome, reception of the news of the Massacre of St Bartholomew at, ii. 145.
Rothes, Earl of, joins the insurgents, i. 112.
Rouen, siege of, i. 91.
Russell, Lord, killed by the followers of Ker of Fernihirst, ii. 309.
Ruthven, Lord, joins the conspiracy for the murder of Riccio, i. 131—assists at the murder, 138—flees to England, 144—signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, 342—is made Earl of Gowrie, ii. 245—detains King James in Ruthven Castle, 256—arrested, and his new conspiracy defeated, 268—tried and executed, 269—refuses to give up the casket containing Queen Mary's alleged letters to Bothwell, &c., 270.
Rutland, Earl of, sent by Elizabeth to call out his tenantry, i. 501.

SADLER, Sir Ralph, sent ambassador to Scotland, i. 11—employed by Queen Elizabeth to transmit money to the Lords of the Congregation, 30—writes Norfolk for reinforcements, 47—Elizabeth's commissioner at the Conference at York, 399—his instructions to Constable, the spy, to entrap the Earl of Westmoreland, 506.
Sandilands, Sir James, sent to Paris, i. 57.
Sandys, Bishop of London, recommends that Queen Mary's head be cut off forthwith, ii. 146.
Savage, John, volunteers to kill Elizabeth, ii. 341—his confessions suppressed by Walsingham, 383.
Scone, Abbey of, destroyed, i. 23.
Scotland, state of, in latter half of fifteenth century, i. 2—lairds or lesser barons, a class peculiar to, 3—loyalty of Church and clergy of, 4—patronage of, claimed by the Pope, *ib.* — supremacy of the temporal power in, 5—acceptance of the doctrines of Luther and Calvin among the nobles of, 6—invasion of, by the Duke of Norfolk, 8—proposals to unite the crown of, with that of England by marriage, 9—alliance of, with France, 15—union of the crowns of France and, 24—naval expeditions from England and France against, 33—invaded by an English army under Lord Grey, 41—destruction of the monasteries and religious houses in, 60—unquiet state and disorder of, 473.
Scrope, Lord, his interview with Queen Mary, i. 398—his part in the scheme contrived by Cecil to entrap Mary into resigning the crown, 463—ordered to arrest Leonard Dacre, 515—invades Dumfriesshire, ii. 11.
Secret Council, trial of four persons by the lords of, for the murder of Darnley, i. 354.
Sempill, Lord, signs the order for Queen Mary's removal to Lochleven, i. 342—defeated by Lord Claud Hamilton, ii. 133.
Seton, flight of Queen Mary to, i. 143—falsehood of the story of Queen Mary shooting at the butts at, 281.
Seton, Mary, assists Queen Mary's escape from Lochleven, i. 386.
Seton, Lord, escorts Queen Mary to Niddry on her escape from Lochleven, i. 387—is sent on a special mission to Henry III., ii. 272.
Shrewsbury, Earl of, his interview with Queen Mary, ii. 69—presides at the trial of the Duke of Norfolk, 100—having had the custody of Mary for fourteen years, desires to be relieved of his charge, 282.
Shrewsbury, Bess of Hardwick, Countess of, accuses her husband of adultery with Queen Mary, ii. 283.
Sidney, Sir Philip, death of, ii. 325.
Silva (De), Spanish ambassador, Murray's interview with, i. 214—his interview with Count Moretta, 276.
Simancas, document preserved at, giving an account of an interview of Murray with De Silva, the Spanish ambassador, i. 214—its description of the letter alleged by Murray to have been written by Queen Mary to Bothwell does not tally with the Glasgow letter, 217—inference from this that the forgers first drew up a letter couched in stronger terms than that which they ultimately produced, *ib.*
Solway Moss, surrender of the Scots at, i. 8.
Somerset, Duke of, his invasion of Scotland, i. 14, n.
Southampton, Earl of, a prisoner in the Tower, ii. 83.
Spens, John, placarded as one of the murderers of Darnley, i. 278.
Spynie Castle, Bothwell at, i. 369.
St Andrews, nomination and appointment of bishops to the See of, i. 4, 5—Archbishop of, committed to prison by King James V., 5—ordered by Henry VIII. to be destroyed, and its inhabitants put to the sword, 14, n.—cathedral of, destroyed, 23.
St Bartholomew, the Massacre of,

prompted by revenge for the assassination of the Duke of Guise, i. 93—reception of the news of the Massacre of, at Rome and Madrid, ii. 145—effect of, on the prospects of Queen Mary, *ib.*—the Massacre of, was the result of panic, and not of premeditation, 137.
St Denis, interview of Throgmorton and Anthony de Bourbon at, i. 37.
St Germains, treaty of, ii. 135.
Stanley, Sir Edward, a prisoner in the Tower, ii. 83.
Stanley, Sir Thomas, a party to the conspiracy of Ridolphi, ii. 48—a prisoner in the Tower, 83.
Stewart, Arabella, daughter of Lord Henry Lennox, ii. 283.
Stewart, Colonel, sent to London to treat with Elizabeth for the restoration of the Lennox estates, ii. 257—assists King James to escape from Ruthven Castle, 258.
Stewart, Esmé—*see* Aubigny, Lord.
Stewart, Lord James, i. 44—sent to France to invite Queen Mary to Scotland, 61—visits Queen Elizabeth, *ib.*—has an interview with Throgmorton, 62—instigates the English ministers to intercept Queen Mary on the high seas, 67—present at the first interview between Queen Mary and John Knox, 75—made one of Mary's principal advisers, *ib.*—his proposal to Cecil as to the succession to the crown by England, 76—his alleged desire to obtain the Scottish crown, 77—resists the tyranny of the preachers, and obtains liberty of worship for Mary, 78—his marriage, 79—defeats the Earl of Huntly near Aberdeen, 87—is made Earl of Murray (*see* Murray, Earl of), 88.
Stewart, James, son of Lord Ochiltree, accuses Morton of the murder of Darnley, ii. 213—is made Earl of Arran, 219.
Stewart, Margaret, wife of John Knox, ii. 164—her second marriage, *ib.*
Stewart, Mary — *see* Mary Queen of Scots.
Stewart, Matthew, Earl of Lennox, returns to Scotland, i. 99.
Stewart, Lord Robert, quarrel between him and Darnley at Kirk-of-Field, i. 242.
Stirling, Darnley visits Mary at, i. 436—castle of, held by the Earl of Mar for the Regent Murray, 376.
Strathbogie plundered, i. 88.
Strickland, Miss, her opinion that Fountainbridge was the locality where Queen Mary was seized by Bothwell, i. 307.
Stubbs, John, loses his right hand for publishing a pamphlet against Queen Elizabeth's marriage with the Duke of Alençon, ii. 231.
Sussex, Earl of, Elizabeth's commissioner at the Conference at York, i. 399—his opinion that Queen Mary has the best side of the case, 414—advises the detention of Queen Mary in England, 415—his letter to Cecil furnishes a key to the future proceedings of Elizabeth and her ministers, 417—letter of, to Sir William Cecil, 518—invades Teviotdale, ii. 10—ravages the western Border, 15.
Sutherland, Earl of, forfeited, i. 89—permitted to return to Scotland, 121—attached to the queen's party, 343.

Tamworth, John, the bearer of an extraordinary message from Elizabeth to Mary, i. 118—seized as a vagrant by Lord Hume, 119.
Taylor, William, a servant of Darnley, i. 268.
Teviotdale, ravaged by the expedition under the Earl of Sussex, ii. 10.
Thorpe, J. Markham, his testimony to the want of proof against Queen Mary, ii. 490.
Thou (De), copies the monstrous fictions of Buchanan's 'Detection,' i. 177.
Throgmorton, Sir Nicolas, English ambassador in Paris, i. 29—his interview with the King of Navarre, 37—advises Elizabeth to pay the services of Lord James Stewart as a spy, 63—repeats Queen Mary's remonstrance on the refusal of a safe-conduct by Queen Elizabeth, 65—charged with being instigator of civil war in France, 91—sent on a special mission to Scotland, 102—writes to Elizabeth that the Confederate Lords intend to charge Mary with the murder of her husband on the testimony of her own handwriting, 346—informed by Maitland that no reliance could be placed upon Elizabeth's conduct, 357—desired to recommend that the young Prince James should be sent to England, 360—refused admission to Queen Mary at Lochleven, *ib.*—believes the life of Queen Mary to be in extreme peril, 362—sends Rokesby to Maitland with his proposal for the murder of Bothwell, 369.
Throgmorton, Francis, tortured and executed, ii. 266.
Tilbury, assembly of English army at, to resist the Spanish invasion, ii. 481.
Titchbourne, Chidiock, joins the Babington conspiracy, ii. 342—his confession, 383.
Tolbooth, placards affixed to, denouncing the supposed murderers of Darnley, i. 278.

Toledo, Don Frederick of, a body of Spanish troops to be landed in England under, ii. 48.
Tranent, Mary and Bothwell represented as shooting at the butts for a dinner at, i. 270.
Treaty of Berwick concluded, i. 39—of Edinburgh, conditions of, 50—refused to be ratified, 53—Elizabeth's resentment at this refusal, 65—Mary's defence of her refusal, 66.
Tremaine, Captain, i. 37.
Trent, Council of, declaring marriage indissoluble, i. 243.
Tutbury Castle, condition of, during Queen Mary's residence, ii. 297.
Tytler, Patrick Fraser, his assertion that Mary signed the Catholic League, i. 126—his statement that Morton and Argyll, though subscribing the bond in favour of Bothwell, were plotting for his overthrow, 304—has admitted on insufficient grounds the charge against Hamilton, Archbishop of St Andrews, of advising that Mary should be put to death, 366.

VALENCE, Bishop of, named plenipotentiary by Queen Mary, i. 49.
Verac, M. de, envoy from France, arrives in Edinburgh after the death of Regent Murray, ii. 7—captured by Thomas Crawford in Dumbarton Castle, 91.
Villeroy (de) M., envoy of the King of France, refused admission to Queen Mary at Lochleven, i. 360.
Vitelli, Marquis of, indicated by Ridolphi as a suitable person for the assassination of Elizabeth, ii. 54.

WADE, William, sent to Sheffield Castle as a spy on Queen Mary, ii. 279.
Walsingham, Sir Francis, sent on a special mission to Paris, ii. 37—announces that he has discovered a secret project for the marriage of Mary to the Duke of Anjou, *ib.*—as Secretary of State for England is sent to Edinburgh to treat with King James, 260—employs agents to intercept Queen Mary's correspondence, 289—his devices to implicate Queen Mary in the Babington conspiracy, 342—is a party to the Babington conspiracy, 355.
Warwick, Earl of, receives command of the English forces in France, i. 94—surrenders Havre, 95.
Wemyss Castle, i. 101.
Wesley, John, his conviction of Queen Mary's innocence, ii. 489.
Westminster, Conference at, i. 189, 429—retirement of Queen Mary's commissioners from, 430, 451—production of the Book of Articles at, 431—production of the coffer containing the alleged letters at, 447—depositions and confessions of parties executed for Darnley's murder produced at, 450—two important documents which had been produced at York not produced at, 451—Elizabeth's commissioners continue their labours notwithstanding the retirement of Mary's commissioners from, *ib.*—Thomas Nelson and Thomas Crawford produced as witnesses, 452—Murray's journal produced, 454—break in the proceedings of, 455—results communicated to six of the nobility specially summoned to meet at Hampton Court, *ib.*—Cecil's notes of proceedings at, 550.
Westmoreland, Earl of, in conference with Queen Mary's friends in London, i. 497—his open rebellion, 500—flees to Scotland, 502—his conduct on receiving the news of Murray's death, ii. 4—his raid into Northumberland, *ib.*—dies at Brussels, 132.
Whitelaw, Alexander, an emissary of the Congregation, proposes the marriage of the Earl of Arran with Queen Elizabeth, i. 29.
Whittingham Castle, Bothwell at, i. 179, 212, 261.
Willock, John, a refugee preacher, i. 19—declares the Queen-Regent may be lawfully deposed, 27—visits Mary of Lorraine on her deathbed, 49.
Wilson, Patrick, a servant of Bothwell's, i. 244.
Wilson, Dr Thomas, prepares an English edition of Buchanan's 'Detection,' ii. 81—the credit due to his testimony against Norfolk, 112.
Wingfield Manor, Queen Mary resident at, ii. 2.
Winter, William, English admiral, i. 35, 40.
Wishart, George, i. 13.
Wood, John, secretary to Regent Murray, his letter to Thomas Crawford for more matters against Queen Mary, i. 199—writes to Maitland that the queen has accused him and Morton of the murder of her husband, 399.
Wotton, Sir Edward, sent to Scotland to conclude a league with King James, ii. 308—joins with the Master of Gray in the plot against Arran, 309—flees to Berwick, 312.
Wotton, Dr, accompanies Cecil to Scotland, i. 49.

YORK, a meeting proposed between the queens Mary and Elizabeth at, i. 97—the Earl of Northumberland executed at, ii. 131.

York, Conference at, i. 199, 395, 402—statement for the Queen of Scots at, 403—answer of Murray thereto, 404—reply for the queen, 405—Murray has secret dealings with the English commissioners at, 407—letters produced at, 408—warrant alleged to be signed by Mary for the subscription of the bond at Aynslie's supper produced at, 410—opinion of the English commissioners on the secret evidence, 412.
York and Lancaster, wars between the houses of, i. 1.
Young, Peter, tutor to the young king, rejects the bribes of Bowes, ii. 208.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS, EDINBURGH.

A SECOND AND ENLARGED EDITION

OF THE FIRST VOLUME OF

MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS AND HER ACCUSERS.

With a Photograph from the Bust on the Tomb in Westminster Abbey.

Price 15s.

EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS.

"A careful study of Mr Hosack's book will show that he has explicitly or implicitly answered every one of the fifteen arguments in the famous Note L. of Hume's History of this reign."—*Quarterly Review.*

"No advocate could have placed the Darnley tragedy in a better light for Mary."—*Spectator.*

"Whatever surmises may be formed about Mary's knowledge or assent, there can now be no doubt that the murder was contrived, not by Mary, but by her accusers."—*Scotsman.*

"The story never flags, and it should be perused and reperused by every one interested—and who is not?—in the subject of which it treats."—*Athenæum.*

"He has confuted those who, by brilliant writing and a judicious selection of evidence, paint the Queen of Scots as an incarnate fiend, and who are dramatic poets rather than historians."—*The Times.*

"Within our present limits it is, of course, impossible for us to show fully the masterly way in which the author deals with the whole mass of evidence before him, sifting the few grains of truth out of the abundant error, and refuting the bitter accusations of Mr Froude with a quiet skill which well becomes his subject. . . . Mary of Scotland has here been brought face to face with her accusers by an advocate who has thoroughly studied his intricate and difficult brief, and has conducted his cause with rare discrimination, impartiality, and glowing fervour. No student of history will henceforward master the annals of Scotland and learn the true aspect of the sixteenth century without fully digesting the record which Mr Hosack has here so ably prepared for him."—*Standard.*

"We must, with the fullest sincerity, do justice both to the candour of his arguments, partisan as he avowedly is, and to the great industry with which he has sought out facts bearing upon his arguments, as well as to his controversial skill in their use. His work is a most valuable contribution to the literature of the question; and on a subject which has been held threadbare, he has displayed the ability to impart a freshness and novelty of which it could hardly have been deemed susceptible."—*London Scotsman.*

"We feel that it is impossible, in this short summary, to do anything like justice to Mr Hosack's narrative, but we earnestly recommend all who feel an interest in perhaps the chief of all our national historical problems, to study for themselves the reasoning by which he has, in our opinion, conclusively made out his case."—*John Bull.*

"He has treated with rare impartiality, and with most scholarlike skill and patience, every part of the story of the Queen of Scots, from her birth down to the death of the Regent Murray, in 1570; and there is not one of the many controversies which beset the student at every step, to which he has not brought if not new light, at least the aid of calm, patient, and enlightened criticism. Without avowedly following the track of Mr Froude, he has had that historian's narrative under view at every point of the history; and he has calmly but successfully exposed many of his inaccuracies, and exploded many of his reckless and unauthorised assumptions."—*Dublin Review.*

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

NEW AND CHEAPER EDITION.

THE

HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.

By JOHN HILL BURTON,

HISTORIOGRAPHER-ROYAL FOR SCOTLAND.

CONTINUED IN THIS EDITION DOWN TO THE EXTINCTION OF THE LAST JACOBITE INSURRECTION.

Eight Volumes, crown 8vo, and Index Volume, bound in cloth, £3, 3s.

EXTRACTS FROM REVIEWS.

"The best account that has yet been published of the national being and life of Scotland."—*Times.*

"Mr Burton has the highest qualifications for the task. In no other history of Scotland with which we are acquainted are there the especial attractive graces which distinguish these volumes of national history."—*Athenæum.*

"Mr Burton has given us, for its scale, one of the completest histories that we ever saw of any country."—*Saturday Review.*

"Mr Burton has now completed a great and noble work with the same impartiality, vigour, and clearness which characterised the opening volumes."—*Standard.*

"We must pronounce it the most complete, and, in every sense, the best history of Scotland extant."—*Examiner.*

"Not only the most complete and trustworthy history of Scotland yet written, but it will merit a high place among the historical works of our age."—*Daily News.*

"We do not remember to have read so reticent, so calm and dispassionate a history."—*Blackwood's Magazine.*

"Une grande et belle histoire."—*Revue des Deux Mondes.*

"Mr Burton, by the publication of these volumes, marked as they are by soundness of judgment and deep historical research, may hope to secure an honoured and permanent place in the literature of his country."—*Globe.*

"One of the most satisfactory histories of our country extant."—*Morning Journal.*

"The work as a history of Scotland is far the best we have."—*The Academy.*

"It is not often that the second edition of a standard work like Mr Burton's 'History of Scotland' demands from the reviewer more than the briefest and simplest of notices. But it is not often that we meet with a second edition which has undergone such a thorough revision and careful reconstruction as in this case. So far as the first volume is concerned, it may be said to be substantially a new work, written up to the time and to the lights which it affords."—*Scotsman, March* 21, 1873.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 July, 2018